

1290. Also, petition of Rueckheim Bros. & Eckstein, Chicago, Ill., urging the preservation of the States' commission jurisdiction, as provided in House bill 10453, with the exception of creating a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1291. Also, petition of Illinois Retail Hardware Association, Elgin, Ill., advocating the retention of the present powers of the various State commissions as provided for in House bill 10453, but opposing the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1292. Also, petition of Mort Reiser Co., of El Centro, Calif., urging the passage of the so-called Kettner bill, House bill 11553, providing for the temporary financing of a canal designed to tap the Colorado River for irrigation purposes and give relief to the people of Imperial, Calif., from the dependence they are now under to the Mexican Government for water supply to irrigate their lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

1293. Also, petition of Edison Electric Appliance Co. (Inc.), Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the so-called Kettner bill, House bill 6044, providing for the temporary financing of a canal designed to tap the Colorado River for irrigation purposes and give relief to the people of Imperial Valley, Calif., from the dependence they are now under to the Mexican Government for water supply to irrigate their lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

1294. Also, petition of Bricklayers and Stone Masons' Union of Chicago protesting against the Cummins antistrike and Esch bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1295. Also, petition of Inland Steel Co., Indiana Harbor, Ind., urging legislation relative to House bill 10453, with the exception of the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1296. Also, petition of the Manhattan Electrical Supply Co. (Inc.) of Chicago, Ill., protesting against Senate bill 2232, providing for the placing of the Bureau of Education under the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education.

1297. Also, petition of Appleton Manufacturing Co., Batavia, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10453, with the exception of the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1298. Also, petition of Lehigh Stone Co., Kankakee, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10453, with the exception of the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1299. Also, petition of Western Wheeled Scraper Co., Aurora, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10453, with the exception of the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1300. Also, petition of Bartles-Sweney Oil Co., Peoria, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10453, with the exception of the creation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1301. Also, petition of C. A. Brant and 40 other citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 1699 and House bill 3149, making provision for superannuated employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1302. Also, petition of the Williams Sealing Corporation, Decatur, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 10453, providing for the termination of Federal control of railroads, especially the adoption of the changes outlined in a memorial of the National Association of Railway and Utility Commissioners, so far as this memorial does not approve the formation of a transportation board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1303. Also, petition of American Steel Foundries, urging that in railroad legislation it would be wise at this time to give the railroads a chance to catch up with the growth of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 3, 1920.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1920.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

SOUTHERN LIVE-STOCK PRICES (S. DOC. NO. 209).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of July 25, 1919, the report of the Federal Trade Commission on southern live-stock prices, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (S. DOC. NO. 208).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co. for the year ended December 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3452) authorizing the city of Detroit, Mich., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the American Channel of the Detroit River to Belle Isle.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3327) granting certain rights of way and exchanges of the same across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, in the State of Utah, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9112) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9065) to amend sections 3, 8, 10, 12, 20, and 21 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PLATT, Mr. McFADDEN, and Mr. PHELAN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3371) authorizing Gordon N. Peay, jr., his heirs and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PARKER, Mr. SWEET, and Mr. RAYBURN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11368) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate, and had appointed Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ELSTON, and Mr. CARTER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10207. An act providing for service of process in causes removed from a State or other court to a United States court; and

H. R. 10432. An act to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3418. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern;

H. R. 8953. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Whiteville Lumber Co., Goldsboro, N. C., to construct a bridge across the Waccamaw River at or near Old Dock, county of Columbus, N. C.

### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certified copy of joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, ratifying the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, which will be filed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted at the fifty-fifth annual convention of the National Wool Growers' Association held at Salt Lake City, Utah, and of the New Jersey Retail Clothiers' Association, favoring the passage of the so-called pure-fabric bill, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Rice County, Kans., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Fortnightly Club, of Topeka, Kans., praying for universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of McPherson Post, No. 4, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Independence; of Lebanon Post, No. 240, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Lebanon; and of Silver Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Winfield, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (by request):

A bill (S. 3843) to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 3844) to provide for discontinuing the purchase and sale of grain by the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3845) to provide for increasing the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3846) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Olympic National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 3847) granting an increase of pension to John Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3848) authorizing the Pitt River and the Apwaraki Tribes or Bands of Indians, of California, to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 10207. An act providing for service of process in causes removed from a State or other court to a United States court, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10432. An act to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

#### PAY OF ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, ETC.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3383) to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McKellar	Smoot
Brandegge	Harrison	McLean	Sterling
Calder	Henderson	Moses	Townsend
Capper	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Trammell
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Page	Wadsworth
Culberson	Kellogg	Phipps	Warren
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Watson
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	
Elkins	McCormick	Sherman	
Fernald	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. MOSES. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. KEYES] on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. Call the roll again.

The roll of absent Senators was called, and Mr. HARDING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. McNARY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. SPENCER answered to their names when called.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GERRY, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family.

The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] is detained from the Senate by illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] are absent on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 9, the committee proposes to strike out "50 per cent" and to insert—

20 per cent: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 9, before the words "per cent," strike out "20" and insert "31," and strike out the proviso.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proviso is not in the bill. You can not move to strike out an amendment that is not in.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I was seeking to perfect the committee amendment. I thought that might be done by offering an amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. You can offer an amendment to the amendment; but the Chair understands that the Senator is proposing to strike out the proviso, which is not in the bill.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have been absent from the Chamber for several days, and I am not sure of the parliamentary status. I thought that, as a matter of parliamentary procedure, an amendment might be amended by offering to strike out and in lieu thereof to insert, and I thought an amendment could be perfected also by striking out a part of a proposed amendment, as by inserting something.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it is all right, as the Chair now sees it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the fact that the distinguished chairman and other Senators interested in the pending bill have been kind enough to let it go over for a few days on account of my absence from the Senate, due to illness, because I really feel very much interested in the matter of trying to adjust the increase which is proposed between the pay of officers and enlisted men.

One week ago to-day I offered one or two amendments having in view the same purpose which is sought by the amendment which I have offered to-day. It has been disclosed in discussion here that the pending bill carries with it an increase of about 31 per cent to all of the officers of the Army and Navy, and that in its present form it carries with it an increase of 20 per cent to only a small part of the enlisted personnel of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a question?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Florida when the pay of the enlisted personnel was increased from \$15 a month to \$30 or \$33 a month what increase did the officers get?

Mr. TRAMMELL. At that time they did not get any increase; but I submit that the fact that a private was serving his country for practically nothing and the Government penalized him for a long time by requiring him to serve for \$13 or \$15 a month should fix no standard by which the question of raising his pay should be governed in this bill, which is supposed to provide for increasing the salaries of both officers and privates. I submit that the same conditions in regard to the high cost of living and the same conditions as to the expenditures required for the individual man confront the private as confront the officer. I do not mean that the officer does not have greater expenses and greater responsibilities and greater demands upon him, but that in considering the question of the pay of privates there should also be considered those elements which cause the suggestion of an increase in the pay of the officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Utah spoke of the increase in the pay of privates; but that was during the war, when the privates were conscripted into the Army; and, it seems



to me, it ought not to be taken into account here. I think the pay of the privates should be increased by the same percentage as the pay of the officers is increased, and that it would be outrageous if we did not do so.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, that is the point. My position is that there is no justice, no fairness, and no equity in increasing the salary of the officers at the present rate by 31 per cent and not also increasing the salary of the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy by the same percentage. Take the present cost of living, the present demands upon an officer or upon a private of the Army or the Navy, and consider the salaries of the two; which appeals more, from a standpoint of justice, for an increase? Take the private who gets \$30 a month. It is true that he gets his suit of clothes and his provisions, and then he gets a small pittance of \$30 a month. Take the officer, beginning with the lieutenant, and he receives a salary, with allowances, at the present time of about \$2,500 a year; the captain, with his present allowances, receives a salary of about \$3,200 or \$3,300 a year; a major, with his allowances, receives a salary of from \$3,800 to \$4,000 a year; a lieutenant colonel receives probably as much as \$4,600; and yet it is contended that these officers who are receiving salaries of from \$2,500 to \$6,000 or \$8,000 a year should have their present salary increased by 31 per cent, and that as to the poor enlisted men, who are only getting \$30 a month, 48 per cent of them should not receive any increases whatever, and those who do get any increase should only receive an increase on the basis of 20 per cent. I can not understand the justice of dealing with the situation in that way.

Of course, there is some talk about the condition of the Treasury. If the Treasury will only stand an expenditure of a certain amount of money for salary increases, why confine the salary increase to officers? Why not equalize conditions, and if it becomes necessary to do justice by the enlisted men, cut down the percentage, and give the enlisted men and the officers the same percentage of increase, making that percentage what the Treasury will stand? When it comes to dealing with the enlisted man, who had to sacrifice during the war at \$30 per month, who had to go into the positions of danger and of hazard, and many of whom had to sacrifice their lives, do not say to them, when it comes to the question of giving them an increase of salary, "We have got to safeguard the Treasury," but when it comes to dealing with officers' salaries and increasing the salaries of officers, receiving from \$2,500 a year up, say, "We have rather a prosperous Government; we have sufficient funds to increase your salaries 31 per cent." I can not see the logic of that; I can not see its justice or equity. Why that contention should be used against the enlisted man and not be used against the officers I can not understand.

What I desire, Mr. President, is to put them all upon an equal footing; to do justice by the officer; to accord him equity; to give him recognition for his services; and also to give the same consideration to the enlisted man. I am unalterably opposed to picking out 48 per cent of the Army that is the poorest paid and saying to that 48 per cent, "We do not propose to give you an increase of salary at all, although this Government is able and is willing to increase the salary of a major, who is already getting about \$4,000 a year, \$1,200 a year more, by giving him \$100 a month more, and yet we are not willing to increase the pay of enlisted men on a basis of 30 per cent, which would amount to about \$9 a month." No objection is made by the friends of the Treasury to giving an officer receiving \$4,000 a year an increase of \$100 a month in his salary—and the increase grows heavier as the salaries become larger—but when it comes to dealing with the private, who is only getting \$30 a month, all at once it becomes so essential to protect the Treasury of the country that it is said we can not give him an increase of \$9 a month.

Mr. President, I appreciate and respect the officers. A great many of them performed very commendable service. Many of them are worth what they are receiving; while, on the other hand, many of them are not worth what they are being paid. There are a great many officers in the American Army to-day, so far as that is concerned, who are drawing considerably more salary than they could draw in private life. That is not true as to all of them. There are others who could do better in private life probably than they are doing in the public service. I have no regret in connection with giving a reasonable increase to those who are entitled to it—and we have got to deal with all alike; we have got to deal with the officer who goes ahead and does his duty and performs commendable service and fix a salary based upon that class of officers, instead of the class of officers who are serving in some of the departments, some of them drawing major's salaries and lieutenant colonel's salaries, and

doing nothing except what might be called clerical work that a civilian employee would only get \$100 or \$125 a month for doing. I have been impressed with the fact that we have had too many officers around Washington drawing big salaries who are doing little else than clerical work; yet in order to provide for those who merit an increase it is necessary to treat all alike. It is not a matter of contending against the officers, for I respect and esteem those who have done their duty; but it is a matter of appealing, as I see the matter, for justice for the enlisted man. That is why I have offered the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, following the logic of the Senator from Florida, there is absolutely no reason why we should not increase the enlisted men's salaries and make them the same as the salaries received by the commissioned personnel of the Army. Why not do that? Why not give the enlisted men, 200,000 or, possibly, 250,000 of them, exactly the same salaries that are given the highest-paid commissioned officer in the United States Army? It will be found, Mr. President, that the Senators who are insisting so strenuously upon increasing the enlisted man's salary will be denouncing anything that looks like universal military training, because it costs so much, and, besides, tends to militarism and the Prussianizing of the American Army.

If you should search the legislative history of the country over, you could not find a better way to create militarism in this country than by raising the salary of the enlisted personnel to such a figure that everybody would want to go into the Army. The work would be easier than in the industries or on the farm, and the pay better.

I have always opposed these increases. I opposed the increase when the national-defense act of 1916 was up for consideration. The proposal does not recognize that any duty at all devolves upon the young men of the country to serve their country in their country's need without payment of a large compensation therefor. The men who go into the Army in times of peace go in because they like the Army, or for physical training, or for the education it affords, or in many cases in times of peace many of them are ne'er-do-wells, who go into the Army in order to find a place to earn a living easily and a place to rest, and not because they have any particular love of country. In times of war, however, conditions are different. Young men go into the Army not so much because they love the Army or for a life of ease but because they love their country. They do not go into it for pay at all, and I venture to say that 90 per cent of the young men who went into the service with the American Expeditionary Forces would have gone into it without any pay whatsoever but simply because they wanted to serve their country.

Mr. President, it will absolutely bankrupt this country to undertake to increase the pay of the enlisted personnel proportionately to the increase in the pay of the commissioned personnel of the Army. As a matter of fact, the young men who go into the service in times of peace go into the service because they like the service, and they go in and serve only three or four years and then go out. They do not intend in many instances to make it a profession. The commissioned officer is trained at the expense of the Government in the great majority of cases, and he goes in to make it his business and his profession, and he marries and raises a family, and he is bound to maintain them conformably to his station in life. The enlisted man goes in and goes out, and practically none of them, except those who become noncommissioned officers, ever marry or raise families. The noncommissioned officers are professional soldiers. They are the backbone of the Army. They are the training force of the Army, and provision is made in this bill for increasing their pay.

I think it would be a very great mistake to undertake to increase the pay of the enlisted men; and I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that these young men who go into the Army as volunteers in peace times at the ages of 15 to 25 make more money than many of the clerks who are working in Washington at \$125 to \$150 per month. They do not have any rent to pay; they do not have any clothing bill to pay; they do not have any board bill to pay; and they come out at the end of the month and every dollar of the \$30 that they get is simply that much money saved. On the other hand, we know from discussions here in the Senate and we know from the evidence that has been adduced before the committees that young men and young women who are working here for \$125 to \$150 a month do not have anything left at the end of the month because they have to pay high prices for everything they have. The Government of the United States takes care of these young men, and, in addition to that, they are furnished under the law now an education if they see fit to acquire an education.



A few days ago it fell to my lot to visit Camp Holabird, in Maryland, where they have about 1,000 young men who went into the service voluntarily in order to learn some trade. They start in at the very base of manual training, and they go through to a point where they can absolutely take an automobile from the ground and manufacture one, with the result that after one year's service in this industrial-training school they are furnished positions in the automobile factories of the country, the officers over there tell me, at salaries ranging from \$40 to \$60 a week. They are trained mechanics. They understand the automobile in every part. They have specialized in the carburetor system, or in the motor system, or in the ignition system, or some other part of an automobile. They can specialize as well as become proficient in the whole of the automobile parts; and so it is that these young men who go into the Army under this volunteer system will have the benefit of the Government's training by expert teachers, and they go out not only better men from a disciplinary standpoint and from a physical standpoint, but they go out with their hands, their eyes, and their brains trained to occupy a place in life that will entitle them to receive better salaries.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for just a moment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice that this bill carries with it an increase in the pay of all enlisted men and members of the female Nurse Corps of the Army. How many female nurses are there now in the Army?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know what the Nurse Corps is now. It was very large during the war, but it has been gradually reduced. They did not have as many as they wanted during the war.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask what is the salary of a nurse?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is a bill pending now to give them the relative rank of a lieutenant. That would make the salary about \$125 a month.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator is mistaken, in that that provision which is carried in the Army reorganization bill would give the nurses the pay and allowances of officers, but not the assimilated rank.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; I believe that is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the pay of the nurses runs from \$60 to \$100 a month. I am not certain, however.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask how many nurses there are in the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not remember how many there are. I can ascertain the number in a short time.

Mr. HARRISON. Did they receive more money while they were abroad than they get in this country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think they received the 20 per cent extra foreign-service pay.

Mr. HARRISON. I have understood that they only receive now \$60 a month.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the lowest grade.

Mr. HARRISON. Most of them are in the lowest grade, are they not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume so. That is always the case in any military establishment.

Mr. President, I rise, first, to a parliamentary inquiry. My recollection is that the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] offered two amendments to this amendment upon the first day that the bill was brought up, first changing the 20 per cent in line 9 to 30 per cent, and that was voted upon, and then moving to strike out the proviso, and that was voted upon and defeated. Is it in order to move again to strike out the proviso?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I submit that the amendment as proposed in its present form raises a different question from the amendments as offered heretofore. It fixes a different percentage, and it couples them together, and they stand together. In the other instance they stood separate and apart. In other words, the test would be whether or not this amendment would carry with it a different effect from that which the other amendment would carry if adopted; and as a matter of fact it would carry with it a different effect if adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The former amendment was to strike out "20" and insert "30."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is to insert "31."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. Then a motion was made to strike out the proviso, and that was voted upon and failed of passage. Now the Senator from Florida moves to strike it out again as part of another amendment. That question has already been voted upon by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the motion to strike out "20" and insert "31" is in order; that the rest of the motion, to strike out the proviso, is not in order in the Committee of the Whole; that the only way in which the question can be raised is to reserve a separate vote upon it when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] will be adopted. I think we all recognize the fact that the pay of officers and of men should be increased. I think it should be increased, and it seems to me the increases provided in the bill for the officers are reasonable and fair, and I intend to vote for that provision as far as the officers are concerned; but I think it is absolutely fair to the men that their compensation should be increased also. Their salaries are very small. They get \$360 per year. We are having difficulty about getting troops for the Army, and no wonder, with the pay as small as it is. The increase provided for by the amendment of the Senator from Florida is only \$117.50 for each man.

I think it is no more than fair that we should treat the officers and enlisted men of the Army on the same basis. We do not change their relative pay at all. The Senator from Oregon suggested that the position of the Senator from Florida was that we ought to increase the pay of privates to the same point as the pay of officers. I did not understand the Senator from Florida to make any such claim at all. His purpose was merely to raise them horizontally all along the line, recognizing the differences that now exist in the pay.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I correct the Senator? I did not claim that the Senator from Florida insisted upon raising the enlisted men's pay as high as the pay of the commissioned personnel. I said his logic led to that conclusion.

Mr. McKELLAR. I misunderstood the Senator, then. I thought he said that the Senator from Florida had suggested doing that. Now, I think it is but fair that whatever rate of increase is given to the officers, we should provide the same increase for the men. It is because of the high cost of living that we are doing this thing. Very well; the same high cost of living applies to the enlisted men in the Army just exactly as it does to the officers, and the same rule ought to be applied. We ought not to have one yardstick by which to increase the pay of the officers and another one by which to increase that of the men.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. KING. As I understand, the Army pays for the clothing of the men, furnishes them their food, and furnishes them their quarters, so that the high cost of living has absolutely nothing to do with their living expenses, whereas with the officers they have to furnish their own clothing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the high cost of living does have everything to do with the living expenses of the men. We know that the very small allowance given the men is not sufficient to support them properly, and we are having great trouble in the Army to-day because we can not get more recruits, and we ought to have them. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Florida will be agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment may not prevail. I speak from the standpoint of the enlisted man. The idea of the private soldier not receiving any additional compensation now applies only to the men when they first go in. In the first place, they can not be married men when they go in, because the rules prevent that. They go in usually as young men for the first term as apprentices, for what they can learn and what they can see, and, if they remain longer, they receive an increase in pay. If they become good soldiers, they become privates of the first class and then are promoted up through the several grades—corporal, sergeant, and so on. So the class to which the proposed increase of pay does not apply are merely the ones who are there to-day and perhaps to-morrow, but usually for a short time, or for only a short time at that salary.

As to the cost of living, they not only get their clothing but they get their food; they get it cooked and delivered to them; they have their beds to go to; while an officer has all of that to provide for himself. The commissioned officers do not reach the rate of pay that has been mentioned by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] until they have served a long time. For instance, the pay of \$4,000 for a major is the maximum after he has served some 20 years. For the first five years



he receives only \$3,000 per annum, a lieutenant colonel only \$3,500, a colonel only \$4,000 after that length of time. Whether men in the Army are officers or not, they are likely to be married and have families. This bill provides very heavy increases of pay for those enlisted men who may have families and have served a long time.

The term "private" is entirely different from the term "enlisted man," because the latter term covers a large proportion of higher-paid men; it covers a much larger number of first-class privates and noncommissioned officers than of privates proper.

These men not only have their clothing and their food furnished them but they have the very best of medical attention; they have the best of dental attention; they have the education there for them if they will take it—vocational and otherwise. Thus the high cost of living for the enlisted man is all borne by the Government, and this of itself amounts to a very large increase in pay. In fact, except in times of war—when, of course, all soldiers have to take like risks—life is made as easy for them as anyone could naturally expect if they have no especial duties to perform. It means merely that they get an amount of training that keeps them in a healthful and fit condition and that educates them.

As I said before, thousands of these men enlist and go into the Army for the time being, with no intention of serving longer than the one term, and if they had no pay at all they would consider that there was no loss but that there was some gain, because, as has been asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], how many of the clerks in Washington are laying up money? How many spend as they go everything they make? A soldier has what is paid to him absolutely clear. There is no occasion for him to spend a nickel except for postage or for tobacco, if he uses it; and his tobacco, or much of it, is furnished him by the Red Cross, Salvation Army, Young Men's Christian Association, and other associations.

When an enlisted man is a good soldier he almost immediately rises above the first-grade payment. If he is a marksman, he receives more each month for that. If he reenlists, he receives more. If he becomes a first-class private, he receives more, and, of course, much more as a noncommissioned officer. In fact, a great many of the enlisted men receive and save more than it is possible for any officer to save during a year, no matter what his rank may be.

The man who enlists in the Army goes in of his own accord. He knows what the future is; he knows there is a chance to rise. The officer goes into the Army and takes his chances of rising. It takes time, long service, continual education. He becomes married, has a family, spends as he goes, and, as we all know, the officers at retirement time are almost always without any competence and have hardly enough to make good the fall between full pay and the three-quarters pay of retirement.

When a private goes in and remains a private, does not rise to the rank of private of the first class, almost always it is his own fault, lack of application. But take the ne'er-do-wells who go into the Army, and they are becoming fewer and fewer, their service does not always last even a great proportion of the term of enlistment.

The officers of the Army have not, since the remembrance of anyone in this Chamber, had any rise in salary except in 1908, a rise that averaged less than 10 per cent. Ordinary privates in the ranks had a rise since that time from \$13 to \$15, and that has been doubled since, and first-class privates and all the other enlisted men have had still higher rates of increase. There is also provision for 20 per cent extra pay for foreign service, whether in war or in peace. So that so far as the conditions relatively are concerned they have had their salaries doubled and nearly trebled, while the officers have had merely an increase of 10 to 20 per cent.

The men in the ranks may be concerned in the high cost of living if they have families, but otherwise it is no concern of theirs, so far as their own salaries and the opportunity to save those salaries are concerned.

The officers, I submit, who have had one increase of 10 or 15 per cent and now have another one offered are relatively worse treated than are the privates. But when one considers that of the privates some 40 per cent are the only ones who draw about \$30 or \$33, and that a great proportion of the enlisted force are receiving two, three, and some of them about four times that increase, one can see that the purpose is to provide for the soldier, first, to make him fit, and second, to provide for those who have increasing responsibilities with age and accumulation of family.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Florida, and in just a word or two I wish to give my reasons for not voting for it.

This increase for the officers is intended to meet the increased cost of living. That is largely the reason given. I would be glad to see the increase limited to two years, with a view of continuing it if the present cost of living continues as it is, but when things get to be normal, to return to the old figures of pay.

But as to the privates, the increased cost of living does not reach them. That percentage of increase falls on the Government. They get the increase by reason of the fact that it costs the Government an amount beyond what it formerly cost to feed and clothe them. As the cost of food has increased, as the cost of clothing has increased, these elements that affect the cost of living, privates receive by the Government paying for it. The Government does not furnish the officers food and clothing. So I think the privates get their increase due to the increased cost of living paid by the Government for the cost of their living.

Again, Mr. President, my hope for the Army is that the enlistments will be for short service, made up of young men who have finished the grammar schools, but have not funds to continue their education. With the liberal provision that has been carried in a recent bill for training outside of the military training to be given privates in the service, as we settle down to normal conditions and have the men in camps and not in active service, I hope that substantial benefits may come to the privates from the educational opportunities for character building and vocational training that has been provided. If with proper enthusiasm that kind of service is given to the privates it will be worth the while of the young men who have not the opportunity to go beyond the grammar school in their educational preparation for life to spend a couple of years in the Army, with their expenses paid, and take advantage of what I hope will be the substantial facilities afforded for special training for different lines and callings.

The situation differentiates the private entirely from the officer, and the reason for the percentage of increase to the officer in no sense applies to the private. It is the officer's life business. I hope that with most of the privates it will be a temporary training school. One is the business of the man for life; the other, I trust, may be a training school, helpful to young men between the ages of 18 and 21, and so helpful to them that the button which shows that a young man served as a private in the Army means that that young man has learned the importance of discipline, of self-denial, of respect for authority; and also that he has had special training in some vocational line that will fit him the better for civil life.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Chair to a recent ruling on this proposition. The Chair has ruled that since we voted on the proviso another vote can not be taken on it, but a vote can be taken on raising the per cent from 20 to 31. That places me in this attitude:

Personally, I am in favor of the increase from 20 to 31 per cent and striking out the proviso, because I think it ought to apply to all the privates and not to a part of the privates. But if we are defeated, for instance, in the amendment now pending, raising the 20 per cent to 31 per cent, without a vote on the proviso, and it gets into the Senate, then the vote will come, say, on the 20 per cent and the proviso together, and if we vote against it, it leaves in the bill the 50 per cent increase; that is, if the committee amendment is not carried.

It does seem to me that we ought to have an opportunity to vote on the whole amendment, because we have not done that. We have voted only on the increase from 20 to 31 per cent. At another time we voted on whether or not the proviso should be incorporated in the bill. Those were separate amendments. We have never voted on the proposition to strike out 20 per cent and insert 31 per cent, and in the same amendment to strike out the proviso. Consequently, when the bill comes into the Senate, under the rules of the Senate we will be in a position where we must vote against the committee amendment and leave in the bill the original provision of 50 per cent.

Personally, I am not in favor of raising it to 50 per cent, because that would be much more than the increase provided for the officers. But I am in favor of making the increase for the privates as much as the increase for the officers, namely, 31 per cent. However, under the ruling of the Chair, unless we can vote on the proposition as now offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] raising the 20 per cent to 31 per cent and striking out at the same time the proviso, we will never have an opportunity in the Senate of voting for that proposition.

So I submit to the Chair that in view of that state of affairs we ought to be permitted to vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

In further discussion of the matter, I may say that there may be Senators who would have voted against increasing the amount to 31 per cent from 20 per cent, but who would have voted to strike out the proviso, and vice versa, so we ought to



have an opportunity of voting straight on the proposition of reducing it from a 50 per cent increase as originally proposed in the bill and increasing the 20 per cent as suggested by the committee to 31 per cent, and on the proviso at the same time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think that the right is foreclosed to raise those questions in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that we can ask it in the Senate. For instance, if the amendment, as proposed by the Senator from Florida, to the committee amendment is defeated, the 20 per cent increase remains in the bill. We have already voted on the proviso and it remains in the bill. Therefore when we get into the Senate we can vote on the proposition of striking out all the Senate committee amendment, namely, the 20 per cent increase and the proviso; but if we should strike it out it would leave in the bill the 50 per cent increase. Some of us are not in favor of the 50 per cent increase, but we are in favor of giving them a 31 per cent increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see any reason why the Senator can not offer an amendment to that effect in the Senate. Why not?

Mr. HARRISON. That is very satisfactory, if we can do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee of the Whole business is utter folly. It has been carried down through generations, but it is utter folly and ought to have been done away with years ago. The Committee of the Whole originated in legislative bodies when there were no such things as committees to consider bills. A bill was introduced, the body resolved itself into committee of the whole, the regular presiding officer left the chair, and the committee of the whole, acting as Senate committees now act, made amendments and reported them then to the body. The Committee of the Whole ought to have been abolished long ago. The only thing it does is to give a double chance. If you get cleaned out in Committee of the Whole, you can start in and try it again in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Under the ruling of the Chair when cleaned out in Committee of the Whole the same proposition can be renewed in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt at all that if the 31 per cent proposition failed, and if the proviso was adopted, you could have a separate vote on the proviso when it came into the Senate, and if it fails there you can move to strike out 50 per cent and insert 31 per cent. You can do anything in the Senate that you can do in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. The thing I want to get at is, if the 31 per cent amendment fails, the proviso as already carried being then in the bill, will we be permitted in the Senate to offer an amendment increasing the 20 per cent to 31 per cent, and vote on that together with the proviso at one and the same time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by the committee, whatever they may be, when we get through the Committee of the Whole, you can move to insert something else. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well. If that is the ruling of the Chair, it is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was to prevent three votes instead of two on the question that the Chair ruled. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. I am released on this vote and at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] and vote "nay."

Mr. RANDELL (when Mr. GAY's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GAY] on business of the Senate. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of the illness of his wife. I have agreed to take care of him by a pair during his absence, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In

his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I learn that that Senator has not voted. I transfer my pair with him to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and let my vote stand.

Mr. BECKHAM. Has the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a pair with that Senator. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. RANDELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and let my vote stand.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence, on account of illness, of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL].

The roll call resulted—yeas 18, nays 28, as follows:

#### YEAS—18.

Ashurst	Harrison	Nugent	Townsend
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Trammell
Gerry	Kirby	Ransdell	Underwood
Gore	McKellar	Sheppard	
Harris	McNary	Sterling	

#### NAYS—28.

Ball	Elkins	Moses	Smoot
Brandegee	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Harding	Nelson	Thomas
Capper	Kellogg	New	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Kling	Page	Warren
Curtis	Lodge	Phipps	Watson
Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	Williams

#### NOT VOTING—50.

Bankhead	Gronna	McCormick	Shields
Beckham	Hale	McLean	Simmons
Colt	Henderson	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.
Culberson	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Stanley
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Sutherland
Fall	Kendrick	Phelan	Swanson
Fernald	Kenyon	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Keyes	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Reed	Wolcott
Gay	La Follette	Robinson	
Glass	Lenroot	Sherman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the amendment proposed by the committee the yeas are 18 and the nays are 28. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] being present make a quorum. The amendment to the amendment is rejected.



Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to reserve the right to have a separate vote on the amendment in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that it is desired to reserve a vote in the Senate on the amendment just acted upon.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to reserve a separate vote in the Senate on the amendment, or to offer an amendment in the Senate increasing the percentage of increase for privates from 20 per cent to 31 per cent, and also to strike out the proviso.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the other amendments to the bill which have been made as in Committee of the Whole. Without objection, they are concurred in. The question now recurs on concurring in the reserved committee amendment. Is the Senator from Mississippi now prepared to offer his amendment?

Mr. HARRISON. I am. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 1, line 9, before the word "per cent," to strike out "20" and to insert "31," and also to strike out the proviso beginning in line 10, on page 1, and going down to the end of line 2, on page 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute amendment for the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). Making the same announcement in reference to my pair and its transfer as I previously made, I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the same announcement regarding my pair and its transfer as previously made, I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I announce the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement regarding the transfer of my pair as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with regard to my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Reiterating my previous announcement upon the last vote concerning my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RANDELL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG. Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I find that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. MOSES (after having voted in the negative). The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], to whom I transferred my pair, having returned to the Chamber and voted, I now transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and will permit my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 29, as follows:

## YEAS—20.

Ashurst	Harrison	McNary	Ransdell
Borah	Henderson	Nugent	Sheppard
Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Sterling
Gore	Kirby	Pittman	Townsend
Harris	McKellar	POINDEXTER	Trammell

## NAYS—29.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Thomas
Brandagee	Harding	Nelson	Wadsworth
Calder	Kellogg	New	Warren
Capper	King	Page	Watson
Chamberlain	Lodge	Phipps	Williams
Curtis	McCormick	Smith, Ga.	
Dillingham	McCumber	Smoot	
Elkins	Moses	Spencer	

## NOT VOTING—47.

Bankhead	Glass	Lenroot	Simmons
Beckham	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Hale	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Stanley
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Sutherland
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Penrose	Swanson
Fall	Kendrick	Pomerene	Underwood
Fernald	Kenyon	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Keyes	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Sherman	Wolcott
Gay	La Follette	Shields	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on concurring in the committee amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is the bill subject to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. KING. I move to amend the bill by adding a new section, as follows:

This act shall expire by limitation June 30, 1922.

The proposed amendment continues the act in force for two years. It seems to me that at the expiration of that time conditions will be so changed as to require new legislation. In my opinion it would be unwise to fasten this bill upon the country for an indefinite period. If it be conceded that there should be an increase in the pay of officers and others who are in the military and naval service of the country, because of the high cost of living, then, I submit, there should be a time limit upon the measure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, that, of course, is a question of judgment. It is pretty hard for us to say what is going to happen two years from now, but I venture to say to the Senator from Utah that when the two-year period shall have expired the Congress of that day will not reduce the pay of anybody, no matter what has happened in the interim.

The important thing in this bill is that the great bulk of the increase in pay is brought about through the payment of a commuted ration, so that if the cost of living has gone down when two years shall have expired the Government's outlay probably will decrease by just that much, because it will cost that much less to purchase and distribute the rations to the officers and to the men. If the life of the proposed act is limited to a fixed period the doors will be thrown open all over again, and if a new arbitrary adjustment is attempted by legislation expressed in dollars and cents to conform with the changed living conditions of that period, if they shall have been changed, Congress will be confronted with the same old difficulty of trying to figure out how much money in cash shall be paid to a man in order to give him what is known as a living wage. The plan of affording an increase by a commutation of rations gives him a living wage, no matter what the living cost, and I had hoped that feature would become permanently fixed in the pay schedules of the Army and Navy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the arguments which have been made in support of this bill are that the low compensation allowed officers, coupled with the very great increase in the cost of living, has made it impossible for them to remain in the Army and that many of them are resigning. There is a great deal to be said in favor of allowing some increase in the compensation of officers, but the conditions that will prevail two years from now, of course, no one knows. It seems to me that when we get back to normal conditions many things will need readjustment, and I believe that with this act in force for two years we can see its virtues and its infirmities, and at the end of the two years we will be prepared to deal justly and fairly with the officers and the privates of the Army. I am not satisfied with this bill and will feel constrained to vote against it; but if the tendered amendment is adopted, I should feel strongly inclined to vote for it. If conditions at the end of the two-year period have so changed that the compensation prescribed by this bill be too great, then Congress can deal with it in a suitable manner. If Congress were not constantly in session, it would be a different proposition; but we know from the history of the past few years that Congress will be in session practically all the time, and with the experience under this bill we will be enabled to deal fairly and justly with the situation when we are confronted with it. I hope the amendment will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service."

#### CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1699, for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Beckham	Harding	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Harris	Myers	Sterling
Calder	Harrison	New	Thomas
Capper	Henderson	Norris	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones, S. Dak.	Nugent	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dillingham	King	Pomerene	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Ransdell	Williams
Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard	
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. GRONNA. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. ASHURST and Mr. PITTMAN answered to their names when called.

Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. PHIPPS, and Mr. BORAH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is it proper in the midst of the roll call to make a motion to adjourn?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate adjourn.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 3, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Milton O. Beebe, Chaplain of the United States Army, as follows:

Our Father, it is with a sense of gratitude for Thy past mercy and dependence upon Thee for present blessings that we call upon Thy name this morning. Help us to go forth to the duties of to-day unafraid, with a consciousness of Thy presence ever with us, knowing that until the evening shadows fall, indeed forever, Thou wilt be our guide. Give us strength to do only those things Thou wouldst have us to do and which will reflect honor on Thy holy name among our fellows. For our Nation we pray that it may be Christian in every essential. For those who create our policies and establish our laws we pray for divine guidance and wisdom. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### HELIUM GAS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a brief statement as to the discovery, use, and production of helium, a non-combustible gas, about which there is much misunderstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of helium gas. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1920.

To Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I hereby resign as member of Committee on Agriculture, to take effect at once.

E. J. JONES,  
Twenty-first District, Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1920.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,  
Speaker of the House, Capitol.

MY DEAR SIR: I respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the following-named committees: Invalid Pensions, Census, Insular Affairs, Expenditures of the Department of Commerce.

Respectfully, yours,

WILLIS J. HULINGS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1920.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sir: I hereby present my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Very truly, yours,

HENRY W. WATSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following nominations for election to membership of committees, and move their election.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MONDELL moves the election of the following Members to the standing committees of the House:

HENRY W. WATSON, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

EVAN J. JONES, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

WILLIS J. HULINGS, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

LEONARD S. ECHOLS, of West Virginia, to be chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a quarter of a minute in order to ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas ask unanimous consent to proceed for a quarter of a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. How soon may the House expect the vacancy on the Military Affairs Committee to be filled on the majority side?

Mr. MONDELL. When the committee on committees shall have acted.

Mr. BLANTON. These vacancies were filled so promptly I thought that maybe we could expect equally prompt action as to the Military Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Members nominated will be elected.

There was no objection.

#### SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12046, the second deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday the last paragraph on page 20 had been read and a point of order was pending against the paragraph. Unless the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] cares to be heard on the point of order the Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made the point of order that the paragraph is not in order because the latter portion of the paragraph makes the appropriation available during the fiscal year 1921. It is contended that the subject matter of this amendment being within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, is in order on a deficiency bill, although it operates beyond the current fiscal year. The Chair is unable to find any case directly in point. The case cited by the gentleman from Virginia on yesterday enunciates the principle, although the case itself might perhaps be differentiated from the case now pending.

In the syllabus of the citation referred to—Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3562—this proposition is enunciated:

Appropriations for the continuation of work on a public building, and not intended to supply any actual deficiencies, belong to the sundry civil bill, not to general deficiency bills.

Pending the consideration of the bill, Mr. Butterworth, of Ohio, offered the following amendment:

For completing the customhouse and post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio, \$150,000, said appropriation to be immediately available.

Against this amendment Mr. Joseph C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky, made the point of order under Rule XXI.



The Chairman ruled:

Although the bill under consideration is not, technically speaking, a general appropriation bill, yet Rule XXI of the old series was always held to apply to bills of this character, as well as to original appropriation bills. The difficulty with the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio seems to be that it does not come from any committee having any jurisdiction of the subject. The right of individuals upon their own responsibility to offer amendments to appropriation bills has been very much restricted by the third clause of Rule XXI of the new rules. Without commenting upon that clause, the Chair holds that the amendment is not in order, coming from an individual Member of the House and not from a committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, having called attention to the fact that this was a public work or object already in progress, the Chairman said:

There is now a law making an appropriation for the work upon the Cincinnati customhouse and courthouse for the present fiscal year. This bill is one making appropriations for deficiencies only. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio is not to supply any actual deficiency, but to make provision for the completion of the work. If the bill under consideration was the sundry civil appropriation bill, a bill which properly relates to these subjects, the Chair would hold that such an amendment would be in order although offered by an individual.

As the Chair stated at the outset this case can be differentiated to some extent from the case now pending, but is analogous in principle.

One more brief citation from the precedents. It is found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3746:

The general deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration, and Mr. Steele, of Indiana, offered an amendment to insert an appropriation for the Marion Branch of the Soldiers' Home for the construction of a storehouse and repairing the old storehouse and constructing fireproof vaults therein for offices.

Mr. Bartlett, of Georgia, made the point of order that there was no legislation authorizing the appropriation, and Mr. Livingston raised the further point of order that the appropriation was not in order on this bill.

After debate the Chairman—and I may say that the Chairman was Mr. James S. Sherman, later Vice President of the United States—said:

The Chair held in a former Congress, in reference to Annapolis Academy, that an amendment providing for an additional building there was in order. The Chair stated at the time he held so in reference to former decisions, not because he would have so held had it originally come before the present occupant of the chair. If there was no other question involved now than the question of the enlargement of the plant, the necessary enlargement, the Chair would be inclined to hold that it was in order, following the precedent established in the Naval Academy case and cases upon which it was based. If the Chair may suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, it seems to him that in the preservation of harmony between the bills that this item in all fairness ought to be on the sundry civil bill and not on the general deficiency bill. The Chair is unable to find any ruling which holds one way or the other upon the proposition.

The present occupant of the chair is almost in the same situation in which Mr. Sherman found himself at that time, so far as precedents are concerned, except such support as is given by the rulings in the two somewhat analogous cases just cited. In the interest of orderly legislation in the future, it seems to the Chair that the principle announced by Mr. Carlisle in his ruling and again enunciated in the ruling of Mr. Sherman should prevail. This item, which it is conceded is not a deficiency and which might be carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1921, should not, in the interest of orderly legislation, be in order on a deficiency appropriation bill. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The amount which may be expended during the fiscal year 1920 for expenses of branch offices from the appropriation "to further promote and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States" is increased from \$60,000 to \$62,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Why was not the phraseology in this paragraph just to put in an appropriation of \$2,000, which would be an increase, so that there could not be any misunderstanding about the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. That is carried just as the Department of Commerce requested.

Mr. BLANTON. It would have answered the same purpose to put it at \$2,000.

Mr. GOOD. They have the money. It is just an increase of the limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. It is only \$2,000 that we are appropriating?

Mr. GOOD. We are not appropriating anything. They have the money, but they can not spend more than \$60,000 for office rent in branch offices.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I am making is that this only authorizes an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. GOOD. No; it does not do that. It authorizes them to expend \$2,000 more than they are now authorized to expend out of the present appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly what I was trying to get at,

Mr. GOOD. They have money enough. This increases the limitation from \$60,000 to \$62,000. They have a large appropriation and enough money to pay the \$2,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Damage claims: For payment to the Metropolitan Coal Co., Boston, Mass., for damage to wharf belonging to that company at Chelsea, Mass., by collision of light vessel No. 66 on April 10, 1917, \$150.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if this claim of \$150 is one that has been passed on by the department under authority of law to settle claims up to a certain amount.

Mr. GOOD. It is. The department has authority to settle claims not exceeding \$500, and this claim has been settled by virtue of that authority.

Mr. WALSH. This award is satisfactory, I assume, to the coal company?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose so. It is an audited claim.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, some days ago I discussed the cost of a system of universal compulsory military training. Since that time I have been somewhat surprised to hear, from sources that ought to be well informed, the assertion that such a system if inaugurated would enable us to largely reduce the regular Military Establishment and thus bring about economies which would largely offset the cost of such a system.

The fact is that the adoption of a system of universal compulsory military training of the youth of the land would not in and of itself make possible any appreciable reduction of the regular Military Establishment. Its tendency would rather be to necessitate an increase in that establishment, and the facts that lead to this conclusion are so clear and apparent that there is very little ground for any difference of opinion.

Years ago, before we had taken on obligations in the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone, a soldier to a thousand of the population was generally accepted as the very minimum of a military organization. That would mean 110,000 soldiers for our present population on that old basis before we had assumed any of our later-day obligations and before we had developed our modern coast defenses.

Since then we have come into our responsibilities in the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone. A division is the War Department's estimate of a garrison for each of those places, and estimating a division at 27,000 men we have 81,000 as overseas garrisons. Add to this the small garrisons of Alaska and a division of men available for border service, and we have in the neighborhood of 225,000 men of the line.

To put it another way, let us estimate the overseas garrisons at 81,000 men, replacement troops in equal number, who during their term of duty at home are performing a variety of services at home, and we have a total of 162,000. Add to these 30,000 as the very smallest peace detail for our coast defenses, and we have 192,000, and adding to this number about a division of troops for the border and for a variety of services and we arrive at about the same number, 225,000, as the approximate minimum number of the line of the Army. Adding to these the various staff corps, we have somewhere between 225,000 and 275,000 as the minimum for line and staff of the Regular Establishment while we have our present responsibilities overseas, and particularly as long as we have the present unsettled conditions on the border.

No system of military training, unless it be a system of military service under the guise of training, can effect a reduction of the comparatively small Regular Establishment necessary to man coast defenses, to patrol the border, for garrisons overseas, to provide even a skeleton organization for Army posts and training schools, to afford details of instructors for educational institutions, and to form the nucleus of an armed, trained, and organized force in the case of emergency.

On the other hand, the adoption of a system of universal compulsory military training would have a tendency to and would, in my opinion, result in some increase both of the enlisted force and the officers of the Regular Establishment. My estimate of \$700,000,000 as the annual cost of a system of universal compulsory military training, involving the training of 600,000 men annually, was based on the same percentage of officers for the troops in training as are provided for the regular organizations. As a matter of fact that estimate is too low, as to the number of officers and as to the cost, for it would require more officers for the proper intensive training of a given number of men than would be required for a force of equal size in the Regular Establishment, and furthermore, while the men would only be under training six months the officers, or a large part of them, would necessarily be under pay the entire year. These training officers would, as a matter of fact, be a part of the Regular Establishment, but in my estimate I do not add them to the cost of the Regular Establishment, because I had charged that cost in my estimates against the cost of training, where it belongs.



Furthermore, the actual training, at least the initial training, in small bodies, of men in training would largely fall to the lot of the noncommissioned men of the Regular Establishment, and I do not know how these men could be taken from the Regular Army without necessitating an increase of the Regular Establishment by the number of men required to replace these men taken from their organizations for this special work.

It is further true, moreover, that a system of universal compulsory military training would necessitate some additional Regular Army organizations to serve in various capacities in and around the training camps and cantonments, and this in addition to the regular commissioned and noncommissioned officers who would be detached for service with the men in training.

It is true that the Secretary of War has submitted estimates for a Regular Army of approximately 570,000 men, but nobody, outside of the administration and the General Staff of the War Department, is in favor of any such force, and the estimate presented for this, as submitted by the Secretary of War, amounted to \$989,578,657.21, not a dollar of which was to cover the cost of a military training system.

In conclusion, may I sum up the facts of the situation? The Secretary of War has recommended an Army of 570,000 men, to cost nearly a billion dollars. Nobody, outside of the General Staff and the administration, is considering any such establishment. The committees of the House and Senate are likely to provide for a Regular Establishment somewhere between 225,000 and 275,000 officers and men, line and staff. At the present cost this would involve appropriations of from \$425,000,000 to \$475,000,000. This force could not be reduced by any system of military training, unless by military training is meant military service. The tendency would be to increase it, as I have suggested. A system of universal compulsory military training, such as has been proposed, would cost at least \$700,000,000 per year, after the first year. Add to this the cost of the Regular Establishment at the lowest figure suggested, \$425,000,000, and we have a total of \$1,125,000,000 as the lowest annual cost of a moderate Regular Establishment and system of universal compulsory military training such as is proposed, without taking into consideration the expenditure of at least \$300,000,000 to prepare the camps for the system of training.

This estimate is, however, much below the cost of the Regular Establishment proposed by the bill now before the Senate and the universal compulsory military training system which it provides. The regular Military Establishment provided for in that bill, without any military training whatever, will cost at least \$600,000,000. Add to this \$700,000,000 as the cost of the universal compulsory military training system which that bill provides, and we have a total cost of \$1,300,000,000 as the minimum cost of the military program outlined in the Senate bill.

This total is much more than our entire average annual Federal expenditures for all purposes prior to our entry into the European war. At a time when, on the basis of present estimates, we are facing a deficit of nearly \$3,000,000,000, such expenditures are, of course, unthinkable. As no one anticipates putting any kind of a training system into operation at this time there is no reason why the matter should be determined upon one way or another, until we shall find ourselves in better financial condition.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.  
COMMISSIONERS OF CONCILIATION.

To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor, and to appoint commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, traveling expenses, and not to exceed \$1,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$25,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the paragraph. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that we are wasting about \$200,000 per year on this Board of Conciliation, and that this is absolutely a waste of public money to give them an additional \$25,000, as proposed by this section, as it brings no service of any value whatsoever to the people of this country. I want to quote from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of the other day the following, showing exactly what I state is true:

CITY TAILORS ASK QUICK DISMISSAL OF UNITED STATES MEDIATOR—WILL SPURN SERVICES OF LENNON, SENT BY SECRETARY WILSON TO SETTLE STRIKE—CALL CHIEF CONCILIATOR A PARTISAN SYMPATHIZER—SEND LABOR CHIEF LETTER TO SHOW UNION BIAS DISPLAYED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.

A letter asking the immediate dismissal of John B. Lennon, conciliator of the Department of Labor, was sent to Washington yesterday by merchant tailors of this city, who say that Mr. Lennon is a partisan labor sympathizer. Mr. Lennon had just been designated as mediator in the strike between journeymen and master tailors that has been in progress in this city since September 18.

After failure to settle the matter in conference to avoid court proceedings, the merchant tailors asked William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, to take a hand in the matter, stating that the "merchant tailors had given in to the strikers on all points except that of the open and closed shop."

Yesterday morning Philip R. Muller, a tailor, at 1527 Walnut Street, received a letter from the Secretary of Labor saying that Mr. Lennon had been designated as mediator. Mr. Lennon has been associated with the interests of labor for many years. He was treasurer of the American Federation of Labor from 1909 to 1917; editor of the Tailor, a union newspaper, from 1886 to 1910, and general secretary of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America from 1886 to 1910.

Mr. Muller immediately answered the Secretary of Labor, saying: "I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 31 on the subject of the tailor strike in Philadelphia and note that you offer a representative of your department as conciliator in this matter."

"I further note that you state John B. Lennon, commissioner of conciliation, has been detailed by you to make this investigation. I call your attention to the position taken by Mr. Lennon in the following letter, dated December 13, 1919, and published in a paper called 'The Tailor,' the official organ of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America—

Mr. BANKHEAD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, what is the matter before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of a point of order.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He did not ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. I am proceeding on a reservation of a point of order under the direction of the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the point of order that he reserves?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the point of order, and when the times comes I shall probably make it, but I want to see if I can get some light from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Alabama does not want any light on the question. He seeks to protect the Department of Labor, when, from letters received from his district, his constituents do not seem to agree with him. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this paragraph seeking to appropriate \$25,000 is not a deficiency; it is unauthorized by law and it is new legislation. I think it is so clearly out of order that I do not care to argue it; but I do ask unanimous consent to put the balance of this article in the RECORD, showing that conciliation as conducted by Secretary of Labor Wilson is a farce in this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation is clearly authorized by law.

The act of March 4, 1913, creating the Department of Labor, provides:

The Secretary of Labor shall have power to act as mediator and to appoint commissioners of conciliation in labor disputes whenever in his judgment the interest of industrial peace require it to be done.

The Secretary of Labor has appointed 23 commissioners under that authority. The appropriation for this year is not sufficient. The estimate for a deficiency was \$50,000, and the committee reported out one-half the amount for which the Secretary asked.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been an appropriation for this purpose heretofore?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; an appropriation of \$175,000 for the current year, which is not sufficient, according to the statement of the Secretary of Labor, who made a regular estimate for a deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I move first to strike out this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will now read the article from the Philadelphia Public Ledger which I started a while ago:

CITY TAILORS ASK QUICK DISMISSAL OF UNITED STATES MEDIATOR—WILL SPURN SERVICES OF LENNON, SENT BY SECRETARY WILSON TO SETTLE STRIKE—CALL CHIEF CONCILIATOR A PARTISAN SYMPATHIZER—SEND LABOR CHIEF LETTER TO SHOW UNION BIAS DISPLAYED BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.

A letter asking the immediate dismissal of John B. Lennon, conciliator of the Department of Labor, was sent to Washington yesterday by merchant tailors of this city, who say that Mr. Lennon is a partisan labor sympathizer. Mr. Lennon had just been designated as mediator



in the strike between journeymen and master tailors that has been in progress in this city since September 18.

After failure to settle the matter in conference to avoid court proceedings, the merchant tailors asked William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, to take a hand in the matter, stating that the "merchant tailors had given in to the strikers on all points except that of the open and closed shop."

Yesterday morning Philip R. Muller, a tailor, at 1527 Walnut Street, received a letter from the Secretary of Labor saying that Mr. Lennon had been designated as mediator. Mr. Lennon has been associated with the interests of labor for many years. He was treasurer of the American Federation of Labor from 1909 to 1917; editor of *The Tailor*, a union newspaper, from 1886 to 1910, and general secretary of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America from 1886 to 1910.

Mr. Muller immediately answered the Secretary of Labor, saying: "I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 34 on the subject of the tailor strike in Philadelphia and note that you offer a representative of your department as conciliator in this matter."

"I further note that you state John B. Lennon, commissioner of conciliation, has been detailed by you to make this investigation. I call your attention to the position taken by Mr. Lennon in the following letter, dated December 13, 1919, and published in a paper called 'The Tailor,' the official organ of the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America:

"THOMAS SWEENEY,

"General Secretary Journeymen Tailors' Union of America.

"DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I am more than proud of the fight our international union is making for free shops, weekly wages, eight-hour day, etc. Great results have already been secured and the remainder of the fight the tailors are going to win sure. The response of our local unions with the cash makes that a certainty. My contribution has gone in to you and to-morrow I will pay some more to the secretary of No. 24.

"This fight must be won and will be won clear from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and when won the tailors will have one of the best and most effective unions in the United States, and I am sure that victory is on the way and that the J. T. U. of A. will soon achieve a splendid and complete triumph.

"My best wishes to every member, and particularly to the men and women on the picket line.

"Very truly, yours,

"JOHN B. LENNON."

"I am loath to believe," the Muller letter continues, "the charges made upon the floor of the Senate that the Department of Labor contains radicals and Bolsheviks, and I can hardly think that the Department of Labor would employ men as conciliators in settling a strike who have publicly expressed themselves in favor of that strike."

"Might I suggest that the immediate dismissal of Mr. Lennon from the position of a commissioner of conciliation would go far to reestablish the confidence the public should have in the department?"

"Very truly, yours,

"PHILIP R. MULLER."

That Mr. Lennon will fail as a mediator is the conclusion of the merchants, for last night William H. Dixon, chairman of the strike committee of the Merchant Tailors' Association, said that they would have nothing to do with Mr. Lennon when he arrives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is not the information contained in the above article from the Philadelphia Public Ledger pertinent to the proposal in this bill to increase the two hundred-odd thousand dollars we have already appropriated for the purpose of conciliating labor for the present fiscal year by giving them now an additional \$25,000? Is this a subject which does not interest the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]? Out of the 6,000 strikes which occurred during the war, between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, only a comparatively few were settled through conciliation, and then they were settled only by the Government conciliators allowing every demand made by the strikers.

Now, take the case cited by the Philadelphia Ledger. The employers had granted every single demand numerously made by the striking tailors, except the one question of closed shop. The employers had the right to expect from the Secretary of Labor, provided he was running the United States Department of Labor in the interest of all the people and not in the interests of unions, that the Secretary of Labor would send an unbiased conciliator who would give the right of an employer to maintain an open shop proper consideration. All the employers asked was the privilege of running their own business and of employing tailors whether they belonged to unions or not. And the Secretary of Labor sent them Mr. John B. Lennon. Was he a fair conciliator? Was he an unbiased conciliator? Was he a Government conciliator from whom these employers could expect any assistance in obtaining from their employees, to whom they had already granted every other of their numerous demands, the sole right of employing some nonunion tailors if they desired?

Let me read you again the letter from John B. Lennon published in the union's official organ, *The Tailor*, which letter was dated as late as December 13, 1919, on that very subject:

THOMAS SWEENEY,

General Secretary Journeymen Tailors' Union of America.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I am more than proud of the fight our international union is making for free shops, weekly wages, eight-hour day, etc. Great results have already been secured and the remainder of the fight the tailors are going to win sure. The response of our local unions with the cash makes that a certainty. My contribution has gone in to you and to-morrow I will pay some more to the secretary of No. 24.

"This fight must be won and will be won clear from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and when won the tailors will have one of the best and most effective unions in the United States, and I am sure that victory is on

the way and that the J. T. U. of A. will soon achieve a splendid and complete triumph.

My best wishes to every member, and particularly to the men and women on the picket line.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN B. LENNON.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating several hundred thousands of dollars for this Board of Conciliation year after year, and we are asked now, as a deficiency, to give them \$25,000 more. The question is, Are we going to waste it? The people of the United States are getting no benefit from it. The Secretary of Labor is running this, as well as every other of the various departments under him, in the interest of labor unions, and not in the interest of labor in its broad sense. The Department of Labor is improperly named, and should be called the department of union labor, and Secretary Wilson should be more properly called the secretary of union labor. John B. Lennon had indorsed this very strike; had called the strikers brothers; had called their strike his strike; had called their fight his fight; had said that he was proud of their contending for closed shops, which he designated as free shops—free of unorganized labor—and was proud of all of their other contentions; had contributed his money to their cause, and in his letter promised that he would contribute more money, he stating, "This fight must be won, and won clear from the Atlantic to the Pacific," and sent his best wishes to the pickets surrounding the employers' places of business. Was John B. Lennon a proper Government conciliator? Do you approve of the Secretary of Labor sending that kind of a man on Government expense? It is up to you, good Republican colleagues of mine, to decide this question, because you are in the saddle with respect to legislation, and your steering committee can pass any kind of legislation here it wants. Are you willing longer to continue this wasteful farce? The people of this country are going to get tired of this some day. They are slowly organizing and locating responsibility for these conditions. They are going to rise up some day at the primaries and at the general election and they are going to make some of your faces scarce on the floor of the House if you do not pay some attention to some of these things that are going on in this country. Mark my prediction! You have had 5,000,000 organized men, organized like men never have been organized before, who have been attending to the elections heretofore and having legislators obey their will, but, you mark me, not very long from now you are going to have 110,000,000 of people attending to the election; and you had better look out, you had better pay some attention, because when at elections the whole American people begin to speak you will not have any chance to answer, because after the primary is over and after the general election is over some of you will be gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is truth in what the gentleman has said, but I think he exaggerated the case. I have not been in sympathy with some of the men who have been appointed as conciliators. I think in some instances, in quite a number, the Secretary of Labor appointed men who were not in a position, because of their attitude toward the employer, to sit in judgment on his case, but that is not a question for Congress to determine. All Congress can do is to provide the funds. If the funds have been misused, as the gentleman from Texas would have us believe and states, that is a matter that Congress can not very well regulate when we have a department like this. But when we give great power to an executive—and you must give great power to the executive—if he abuses this power and does not appoint the proper persons, are we going to punish the men who compose either the employer class or the employee class when real labor disputes do exist by not providing the machinery that was authorized by this act?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. If the executive of that department is crooked, and we know it, are we not responsible when we continue to put funds in his hands?

Mr. GOOD. I would not want to charge that the Secretary of Labor is crooked. I served with him in the House. I would not make that charge. I thought he was a very able and straightforward and honorable man.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not keeping up with his record in the Labor Department.

Mr. GOOD. Be that as it may, they ask for \$50,000 here. Notwithstanding the fact that there may be some of this fund expended as the gentleman has said, the committee felt that this department would need \$25,000 for the rest of the year, and that it ought to get along with \$25,000. I think perhaps they do at times employ more conciliators than are necessary, but I am not in charge of the department. I do not execute this appropriation; neither does the gentleman from Texas. We have



given the authority to the Secretary of Labor, and in a large measure we have to submit to what he does.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. FESS. Is the chairman of the committee entirely satisfied that the work of the conciliation board has been of value?

Mr. GOOD. I think on the whole they have done a great deal of good work. I think there are cases where they have done very questionable things. For instance, a man came to me a year ago and said that one of the conciliators, Mr. Fred Feick, as I recall, a State senator from Indiana, who lives down, I believe, at Garrett, Ind., went among the employees of two or three of the factories at some town in Indiana there and told them that they ought to be dissatisfied with the hours of labor and with their wages. He left, and in about a week they all struck, and then the Secretary of Labor sent this same man Feick, who had stirred up the strike, back there as a conciliator. Of course, I do not approve a thing of that kind. I do not believe the Secretary himself would approve of a thing of that kind if he knew it. But notwithstanding that, we have had manufacturers come before us, and manufacturers have written us, saying that they have been benefited by this service, and labor organizations and laborers outside of organizations have said to the committee and its members that this law has been of great benefit in settling disputes. I do not approve, of course, the misuses to which the funds are placed at times, but I think there was good reason and wisdom in the law, and that the abuses of the law are the exception and not the rule.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I rise in opposition to the amendment. This item of \$25,000 provides for the maintenance of a service that should be maintained by this Government. During the war \$2,000,000 was spent by what is known as the War Labor Board for mediation and conciliation. Since the end of the war the work has devolved upon the Board of Mediation and Conciliation. The work of mediation in connection with the Shipping Board has also devolved upon them. They handled 1,780 cases, and in practically every one of the 1,780 disputes intrusted to them a strike was prevented and an economic loss to the country prevented.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I will not yield.

The duty of acting as a mediator and conciliator in an industrial dispute is always an unenviable duty. The man must necessarily incur the displeasure of one side or the other. It is inevitable that some gentleman, dissatisfied with the settlement of a dispute, should write to a Member of Congress, as the gentleman from Texas says he was written to, to advise him that he was dissatisfied with the settlement of the dispute.

He says a member of organized labor should not be sent. I presume he thinks that no one but a member of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of the United States should be sent to settle a dispute between labor and capital. But the Department of Labor can not do that. I do not contend that in every instance they should send a man who is identified with organized labor, but certainly if they hope to bring the warring factions together they must send some man who has the confidence of the laborers as well as of the employers.

The gentleman says that some gentleman from Indiana before the committee referred to the conduct of a man who encouraged men to become dissatisfied with their jobs. I never heard that man testify. I wish I had. Any gentleman can make an ex parte statement, but I would have liked to cross-examine him. If convinced he was telling the truth I would certainly have disapproved of such conduct as much as any man in this House.

But the fact is that this board, employing commissioners, has been able to satisfactorily settle nearly 2,000 disputes. Since the 1st of January there has been a great reduction in the number of strikes in this country, and this service has contributed to that happy result at a time when unrest exists all over the world. If this board can settle one industrial dispute, can prevent one strike, it has more than justified its existence and justifies the expenditure of \$200,000 a year for its maintenance. In so far as what the gentleman says about the Secretary of Labor, I want to say this: The Secretary of Labor, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] has said, served as a Member of this House. The gentleman from Texas says he is crooked, but there is not a man in this House who served with Mr. Wilson who will believe for an instant what the gentleman from Texas says. [Applause.] There is not a fair or an honest man in this country, either in the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, in the American Fed-

eration of Labor, or among any other class of people, who believes Secretary Wilson is crooked. They may disagree with him in his policies; they may disapprove of his appointments; but they will never believe him "crooked." I do not approve of some of his policies, but, in common with all Americans, I have unbounded confidence in his integrity. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, may we have an agreement as to the time? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes, to be divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is not unusual for executive officers to be criticized. Wholesale criticism, however, the assailing of a man and accusations of being crooked, ought to have behind them some evidence of a character that would address itself to the membership of the House. I have no doubt but that this committee or commission on conciliation has done much good. There have been mistakes, perhaps, in the personnel of its appointments. But it is a rare thing in executive departments when some mistakes are not made in regard to personnel.

However, my attention was attracted to the criticism upon Mr. Feick, of Garrett, Ind. I know Mr. Feick very well. He is a hard hitter against Republicans in that district, and therefore I hold no special brief in his interest. But it does seem to me that when the name of a man is used on the floor of this House and his activities are thus directly brought into question there should be some supporting evidence for the criticism against him. Knowing Mr. Feick as well as I do, and not being by any means anxious that he should be particularly defended by me, I have wondered if, after all, a little statement like that going out through the Record might not do a man a great injury when really the facts in the case did not warrant the statement. I understand that the chairman of the committee [Mr. Goob] said that he had heard of the incident he mentioned, or did it appear in the record of some hearing? Will the chairman state?

Mr. GOOD. The matter was brought to my attention by a man who claimed to be a manufacturer of that locality, claiming to know the facts; and when the hearings were had a year ago I asked Mr. Samuel J. Gompers, the chief clerk, what the facts were, and he said he did not know. The understanding was that there would be a note put in the record of the hearing, but there was no defense made or explanation made to the charge. You will find it in the hearings on the legislative bill last year. If the statement was not true, it was never corrected by the Department of Labor or anybody else. It was made right to the Department of Labor by this man who called it to my attention, and he claims to have been injured by it.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I know the man has been very active in labor circles and has been sent here and there in conciliation work. I do not know how effective he has been, but he has been retained, as I understand, upon the commission for that purpose.

What I really intended to say is that perhaps what brings this Congress and every Congress into disrepute throughout the country is the wild accusations that are made again and again against men without any basic evidence to sustain them. My own judgment is that this country is big enough and our legislative duties are onerous enough to make it desirable that no reflection should be cast from the floor of this House upon any man unless one felt impelled thereto by the necessity of protecting the public. [Applause.] When that becomes a habit here you will find the Congress will enjoy a higher regard in the minds of the people of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, like the chairman of the committee [Mr. Goob], I thought the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made a strong point by the recital he made in support of his motion to strike out this paragraph. One inadvertent statement by him, however, weakens his case very materially, in my opinion.

Many years ago there came to this country a poor boy from a foreign land. Being poor, he sought honest labor as a means of livelihood. Upon his earnings he supported a family. A coal miner, working most of his time out of human sight, or



at least out of the sight of most people, yet by his demeanor, by his upright character, by his integrity, and his native honesty he won the confidence and esteem of the people of a great congressional district in the State of Pennsylvania. Those people several times elected him to membership in this great legislative assembly. Here he so demeaned himself and proved himself possessed of such great and striking ability that he was appointed to one of the most important committees of the House. There he associated with gentlemen of distinction and won their favor and their applause. From this House he was chosen by the President of the United States, by reason of his ability and his integrity of character, to fill the exalted position of Secretary of Labor.

I say such a man, with such a history, is never a crooked man, and I dissent with all the emphasis I can employ from that part of the gentleman's argument. [Applause.] I say in corroboration and support of what has been said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] that every man who knows Secretary Wilson knows that he is an honest man, a worthy man, and a capable public official. [Applause.] That he has made mistakes I am not here to deny, but in the estimate of some people I have made mistakes; the gentleman from South Carolina may have made mistakes; even the distinguished gentleman from Indiana may have made mistakes; but I do not think either of them has made any mistakes; and some people think the distinguished gentleman from Texas sometimes makes mistakes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes to reply to the gentleman. I have been criticized here very severely.

Mr. GOOD. The time has been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one minute of the time fixed remaining.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Let the gentleman take time on the next paragraph. I shall not object to his taking time on the next paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York objects. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Labor Administration: To enable the Secretary of Labor to carry on the work of mediation and conciliation in labor disputes, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919, \$39,912.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen, I did not make an idle statement in regard to the Secretary of Labor. I had plenty of foundation for it. The record shows beyond any question of doubt that he has spent several thousand dollars of the people's money of this Government unauthorized in behalf of an anarchist, the bomb-throwing anarchist Mooney, in California. The record shows that he has sent his employees unauthorized out to California at the expense of the Government and had them install dictograph machines in the district attorney's office to help anarchists escape the proper punishment of the law. The record shows that he has filled his department down here with representatives of various labor unions over the land on big salaries, paid by the Government, with big expense accounts for traveling, not for the Government but in the interest of various unions. The record shows that in the 6,000 strikes that occurred throughout the war, from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, he has sent as conciliators not men who were unprejudiced but men who were highly prejudiced in favor of one side of the controversy alone, the side of the union, and that a strike has been settled only when every single contention of the strikers has been allowed.

The record, not coming from me but coming from the best friend he ever had on earth, one of the heads of his department, John B. Densmore, shows that this great Secretary had to run away from his own State of Pennsylvania and that he went out to Iowa under shadow and stayed in Iowa for several years until the clouds could blow over before he could go back to his home State. I could recount record after record where he has placed such men in office as Frederick C. Howe as immigration commissioner at New York, whom we Democrats finally had to admit had helped thousands of anarchists to escape

deportation, and the President had to remove from office this Frederick C. Howe, who has since been placed in charge of the Plumb Plan League by organized labor. When his old colleagues and brother members of the United Mine Workers of America called a strike, designated as unlawful and without excuse by both the President and the courts, this Secretary of Labor, without any authorization of law whatever, immediately promised said brother miners a flat increase in wages of 31 per cent, when finally the President's commission allowed only 14 per cent; and this member of the Cabinet, Secretary of Labor Wilson, almost disrupted the Cabinet of the United States trying to defend these miners in their unlawful undertakings and tried to force the Cabinet to do that which was not right when these miners were trying to freeze to death millions of helpless women and innocent little children. And this Secretary of Labor Wilson waited weeks, months, and years, until he has lately been confronted with his confederation, with anarchists, to hold, as he has done within the last few days, that to be a member of the communist organization, which seeks to overthrow and destroy this Government by physical force and violence, is cause for deportation. Oh, if I had time I could give plenty of reasons for asserting that the Secretary of Labor is crooked. Any Cabinet officer of this Government that fraternizes with, helps, aids, and assists anarchists who are trying to overthrow this Government is crooked.

Why, every posted person knows that William Z. Foster is an anarchist, and every person posted knows that John L. Lewis had to sit up all night debating the question whether he would disregard the law and risk severe punishment from the courts administered by Judge Anderson before he decided that "he could not fight his beloved Government" and decided that he would obey the law. And we know that Secretary Wilson fraternizes with such men.

I know that these anarchistic labor leaders do not like me, because in my fight for a square deal for all the people I have given them cause to dislike me. And I know that in this House whenever any of them are attacked there is always somebody ready to take their part and always somebody to applaud them, because Samuel Gompers is always ready and willing to pat them on the back and cause them to be reelected.

My standing is not good with the Anarchist Thomas Mooney, who in cold blood murdered with bombs many innocent people, and my standing with Secretary Wilson and Samuel Gompers, who are friends of Thomas Mooney and who are aiding him to escape proper punishment, is not good. I have no standing with anarchists, either singly or collectively.

When I cite these facts I do not expect any standing with such men as William Z. Foster, who has the approval of Secretary Wilson and his associates. I do not expect approval from the anarchistic leaders of labor of this country, because I have been fighting them here in behalf of the people. I do not expect any standing with them. I do not expect any standing with some of the men in this House who seem ready at all times to lick the foot soles of Samuel Gompers and Secretary Wilson whenever they are justly assailed in this House. I do not expect any standing from that kind of cattle; but I have got a standing with my many brave, honest colleagues of this House and the honest, loyal American citizenship throughout the United States, whose good opinion is worth while, and if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] could see the endorsements that I have gotten from his State and every State in this Union, and if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] could only read some of the letters I have received from his district indorsing the fight that I have been making on this floor, and if my good friend from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]—and he is my friend—could see the splendid letters of indorsement that I have gotten from some of the best men in Missouri in behalf of my stand, these three gentlemen would find that my standing outside of these labor unions and their satellites and their friends and the men who do their bidding is a pretty good standing after all in the country.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will have to decline, as I have not the time. I have only a few minutes. This is not a personal fight I am making. I am making a fight to clean up these departments of improper people in charge of them. It is a fight to rid my Government of anarchy. It is a fight in behalf of the whole people of this country and not in behalf of a little organized clique of 5,000,000 men whose anarchistic leaders are running this Government. You know they are running it as well as I know it. You look into my eyes and you know that every time Samuel Gompers comes in here and tells us to do something he stampedes Congress. Why, Dr. Fess, the gentleman from Ohio, a short time ago got up here and made the best speech I ever



heard a man make one day, and said we ought to be men, that we ought to put all men on the same footing, and that we ought not to exempt organized unions from the law; and in the Committee of the Whole House, where no record is made of how each Member votes, we stood by him; the Republicans stood by him, the Democrats stood by him, and we refused to exempt members of labor unions from the provisions of law. Then Mr. Gompers and his American Federation of Labor came in and gave the membership of this House his orders, and the mouthpiece of organized labor, the gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN], called for a record vote in the House, and the great majority of you bowed your heads, obeyed orders, complied with the dictates of the dictator, and once more exempted members of organized labor from the provisions of general law. [Applause.] How long are you going to keep it up? How much longer is this Government and Congress going to be of, for, and by Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor?

I sympathize with and feel sorry for some of you colleagues of mine, for I know that you want to be reelected, and I know just what troubles you. Here is a sample of what you are afraid of:

In the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, for June, 1918, the vote cast by each Congressman on the Borland amendment, requiring the 240,000 Government employees to work eight instead of only seven hours per day, is given, with the following comment:

If a Congressman's votes and policies have been against the interests of employees this fact should be made known throughout his district, and if he has shown an attitude offensive toward organized labor every voter in his district should know it.

And this red-flag admonition to all organized labor voters was sent broadcast into the districts of the various Congressmen who had dared to vote to require employees to work eight hours a day during war times.

Again, from the September, 1918, issue of the Federal Employee I quote:

THE DEFEAT OF REPRESENTATIVE BORLAND, AS TOLD BY ONE OF OUR BROTHERS WHO WAS IN THE PRAY—A REMARKABLE DEMONSTRATION OF THE VALUE OF UNION SOLIDARITY AND AFFILIATION.

[By Gilbert E. Hyatt, president of National Federation of Postal Employees.]

Those ultraconservative members of the civil service who have not realized the value of organization, particularly in its inevitable and most beneficial aspect, that of affiliation with the other great organized agencies under the banner of the American Federation of Labor, have been given a demonstration so plain that he who runs may read of what these things mean and of the real spirit of unionism.

No Federal employee is ignorant of the constant persecution of his brothers in the District of Columbia under the guise of establishing what Mr. Borland was pleased to name an eight-hour day. The single-minded persistence of the advocate of this measure, culminating in the veto by President Wilson of the appropriation bill carrying the amendment in question, is too well known in all details to need repetition, but the story of Borland's rebuke and defeat by organized labor simply on this ground is a lesson that every member of the civil service should ponder on, for in it is contained the secret of any future defense that they will make and of any future gains for their cause.

An appeal was made to organized labor and every legislative agent in Washington responded. President Gompers sent a scathing telegram to the Central Labor Union of Kansas City (Borland's home), and the legislative agents of the railroad brotherhoods went on record in the plainest language. The writer of this article had the honor, as a member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of bearing their personal message to the railroad men of Kansas City. As a result the Kansas City central body passed a resolution without a dissenting word or vote at a crowded meeting condemning Borland and instructing their legislative committee to organize the campaign for his defeat. A joint committee of railroad men was formed to do a like service for their members, and the outcome was the overwhelming defeat now passed into history.

It should be fully appreciated by the civil-service employees that these men had not one iota of personal interest in the point at issue, and that they had no personal contact with the class of workers attacked. Mr. Borland had done many favors of a personal nature for members of organized labor in his district, and many of the men who worked for his defeat expressed friendship for him, but factional alignments, craft divisions, and personal friendships were thrown aside to fight for a basic standard of their doctrine.

I quote the concluding paragraph of the said telegram sent by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, also published in this magazine, which is as follows:

Let the inspiring word go forth, "We stand by our friends," and administer a stinging rebuke to men of any party who are either indifferent or hostile.

What was Congressman Borland's crime committed for which his office was taken away from him as a punishment? He merely asked that Government employees in war times work eight instead of seven hours per day. He conscientiously believed that when we required our soldier boys to work sometimes 24 hours out of the 24, sometimes in trenches drenched and knee deep in mud, on \$33 per month, who, if he momentarily slept from exhaustion or should demand a single dollar more pay, would be stood up against a wall and shot in eternal dishonor, that it was not unreasonable to demand of Government

employees, many of whom were filling the jobs vacated by these soldier boys, and who were working under pleasant surroundings and safe environments, that in war times especially they should work eight instead of seven hours. By a roll-call vote the House of Representatives twice went on record supporting Mr. Borland in his contention.

Now, let me put into the RECORD again a few matters of history from the RECORD:

NUMBER OF WAR STRIKES CERTIFIED TO BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, February 6, 1919.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of January 23, 1919, addressed to Hon. W. B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, is received. In reply thereto I will say that the Bureau of Labor Statistics of this department compiles, from various newspapers and other sources, as complete a list as possible of all strikes that occur. This list is not complete, and it may also contain some duplications, because it is not always possible to tell from newspaper reports whether the report is concerning a new strike or whether it refers to a strike previously reported. Therefore the figures given can not be more than an approximation. After eliminating duplicates as far as possible this list shows that there were approximately 6,000 strikes between April 6, 1917, and November, 1918, the average duration of which was approximately 17 or 18 days.

Regretting that I am unable to furnish you more accurate information, and trusting that this approximate figure may be of some value to you, I am,

Very truly, yours,

H. L. KERWIN,  
Assistant to the Secretary.

In his autobiography Secretary Wilson of the Department of Labor states that since November, 1873, he has been a member of the Mine Workers' Union, and has taken an active part in trade-union affairs ever since, and was international secretary of the United Mine Workers of America from 1900 to 1908. In his address published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1919, page 1712, Secretary Wilson says:

I make no hesitancy in saying that I am a trade-unionist myself. I believe in trade-unionism. \* \* \* When the demand for shipworkers and shipbuilders came from Seattle our employees in the interior of the country said to those who were applicants for employment that "it is not advisable to go to Seattle unless you are either a union man or willing to join the union," and we are held up as a trade-union department because we made that statement. We continued to make it. We are making it now. We will continue to make it. \* \* \* If there was an industrial dispute in existence we would not be the agency through which labor could be furnished to that industrial dispute.

On June 27, 1919, before the Joint Committee on Labor hearings, Director Densmore testified (pp. 233-234):

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection, are you a relative of the Secretary of Labor?

MR. DENSMORE. I am not any relative of the Secretary of Labor, as has been reported.

SENATOR KENYON. How do you think that story arose, Mr. Densmore? Did you live where he lived, in Iowa?

MR. DENSMORE. Well, Senator, Secretary Wilson, when I was about 5 years old, as you have asked the question, was blacklisted in Pennsylvania, and he could not get any kind of a job, not only in the city where he was but in the coal mines or elsewhere, and he had to leave—

SENATOR KENYON. I did not ask you about that.

MR. DENSMORE. But I want to tell the story. He came to Iowa and he came to my father. My father was the superintendent of the water-supply system of the Illinois Central Railroad, from your city, Fort Dodge, Senator KENYON, to our city, Waterloo, Iowa, at that time, and he got Mr. Wilson a job as a fireman on the Illinois Central, and enabled him to support his family until things blew over in Pennsylvania, when he went back, and it is true that he did live at our house.

What do you suppose, that Director Densmore meant when he said that Secretary Wilson was "blacklisted in Pennsylvania, and he could not get any kind of a job, not only in the city where he was but in the coal mines or elsewhere, and he had to leave"? Blacklisted for what? What had he done that prevented his getting work in Pennsylvania and caused him to go to Iowa? I mention the above, because it may throw some light on late actions of the Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ASSISTING MOONEY.

Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1919, I stated that it was a strange situation when we were appropriating \$1,400,000 additional to apprehend anarchists, while at the same time Secretary Wilson was reported to have spoken at Atlantic City from the same platform with Mrs. Rene Mooney, wife of the convicted anarchist, intimating that he was still trying to get Mooney a new trial, and I cited excerpts from the following papers:

[Daily Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., June 13, 1919.]

Secretary of Labor Wilson, speaking before the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, urged organized labor to refuse to support the nation-wide strike which has been proposed as a protest against the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney. Mr. Wilson told the delegates that the Government was investigating the claim that new evidence justified a new trial, and that he was devoting much time to the case.

The Secretary declared that so far the Government's inquiry had shown that the judge and jury before whom Mooney was tried had conducted themselves properly and that on the evidence the jury had to convict.



Note the statement that "he—Secretary Wilson—was devoting much time to the case."

[Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Mich., June 13, 1919.]

WILSON HINTS AT A NEW TRIAL IN MOONEY CASE—CABINET MAN TELLS LABOR CONVENTION EVIDENCE IS BEING INVESTIGATED.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., June 13.

Secretary of Labor Wilson, speaking before the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, urged organized labor to refuse to support the nation-wide strike which has been proposed as a protest against the conviction of Thomas J. Mooney. Mr. Wilson told the delegates the Government was investigating the claim that new evidence justified a new trial, and that he himself was devoting much time to the case.

[Chronicle, San Francisco, Calif., June 13, 1919.]

UNITED STATES SIFTING EVIDENCE IN STEP TO SECURE NEW TRIAL, SAYS SECRETARY OF LABOR.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., June 13.

Secretary of Labor Wilson, addressing the convention of the American Federation of Labor to-day, \* \* \*. He said the Government was investigating the evidence in the case in connection with the movement for a new trial for Mooney.

And at the same time I charged that Director Densmore had spent some time in California installing a dictagraph in the district attorney's office in an effort to assist Mooney.

On July 1, 1919, my colleague from Texas, Mr. HARDY, spoke in defense of Secretary of Labor Wilson, stating that the above newspaper reports were very unjust and unfounded, and he printed in the RECORD (pp. 2247-2250) what he said was the manuscript copy of the address of Hon. William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor, before the American Federation of Labor convention, Atlantic City, N. J., June 13, 1919, delivered to him by Secretary Wilson. I raised no objection. I am glad he printed it, for it clearly shows that every word in said newspaper articles is true, and that Secretary Wilson deserved even graver criticism. You will note that he began his address by the salutation "fellow trade-unionists." Note also (p. 2249) that in advising the convention not to call a nation-wide strike to force Mooney's freedom, and concerning such advice, he said:

You may accept it or leave it, as your own judgment tells you is best.

He, a Cabinet officer of the United States, head of the Department of Labor, and high up in power and authority in the American Federation of Labor, leaving the question thus open by telling them:

You strike or not strike, as your own judgment tells you is best.

Why should he leave the question open, when he admitted that Mooney had had a fair trial? For he said (p. 2249):

We looked into the Mooney case, and in doing so we came to this conclusion: That so far as the jury was concerned that passed upon the evidence presented to it, it could have come to no other conclusion under its sworn duty than to convict Mooney; that so far as the judge was concerned that tried the case, he tried it with absolute fairness.

Why did not this Cabinet officer of a Republic that stands for law and order then tell his audience, in which there were at least some anarchists, that the State of California had lawfully tried, convicted, and was punishing a red-handed, cold-blooded, murderous anarchist, who had deliberately caused the death of numerous innocent men, women, and children, and the serious injury of scores of law-abiding people, by throwing a bomb into a preparedness parade, and that neither the people nor the Government had any right to go behind the verdict of a California jury and the judgments of the California trial and appellate courts, nor to interfere with justice, law, and order in the State of California by letting unions, ignorant of the evidence, attempt to free a criminal through strikes simply because he was a union man?

But instead of closing the matter with advice of unmistakable directness, Secretary Wilson left it open to be further fanned by the flames of passion and prejudice by stating:

Every effort that the national administration was able to put forth was put forth for the purpose of trying to secure that new trial, and we are not through with it yet. We are still working on it. [Applause, long and continued.]

Note that Secretary Wilson said: "We are still working on it," and "We are not through with it yet," in regard to getting a new trial for an anarchist now serving his just punishment in a California penitentiary. By what authority of law is Secretary Wilson messing in this California case? Who authorized him to work on it or to interfere? Congress has never authorized any investigation. Congress has never authorized the expenditure of one single dollar on the Mooney case. Secretary Wilson has no connection with the Department of Justice. Simply because Mooney was a unionite does not give the Department of Labor any more jurisdiction than the United States Health Department would have where the murderer happened to be a doctor. And it is a very significant fact that all of the Washington papers heralded the news that Mrs. Rene Mooney, wife of the convicted anarchist, having failed to get an audience with the President, went immediately to the Depart-

ment of Labor to see Secretary Wilson, intimating that she was always sure of an audience there.

#### THE MOONEY CASE.

A REPORT ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY OF LABOR BY J. B. DENSMORE, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF EMPLOYMENT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., November 1, 1918.

Hon. W. B. WILSON,

Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to instructions received from time to time during the past six months, I have the honor to report that I have conducted a secret and altogether informal inquiry into the Mooney case, and beg leave to submit herewith the results of my investigation. Before entering into a recital of the various steps pursued in carrying out the operation, it might be well to call attention to a number of peculiar features which have characterized this case from the beginning, in order that there may be no misconception, either as to the issues involved or as to the necessity which arose for the employment on the part of the investigators, of somewhat unusual methods of obtaining information.

On the surface and in its narrowest aspect the Mooney case may be defined as the case of the people of the State of California against Thomas J. Mooney and certain other defendants, four in number, charged with perpetrating a bomb outrage in the city of San Francisco during the Preparedness Day parade, on July 22, 1916, thereby causing the deaths of 9 or 10 persons and the injury of numerous others. Of the five defendants, four have been tried. Two of these, Mooney and Warren K. Billings, were found guilty. Mooney now being under sentence of death and Billings serving a life term in the penitentiary; the other two, Mrs. Thomas J. Mooney and Israel Weinberg, were acquitted. The case against the fifth defendant, Edward D. Nolan, has virtually been dropped for lack of evidence. All five of these persons have been more or less prominently identified with the union-labor movement in San Francisco.

It was charged by the prosecution that these five defendants were animated by anarchistic motives and that the bomb explosion which they were alleged to have planned and consummated was the climax of a carefully laid plot to strike a blow at existing social and political institutions and intimidate all those who were in any way concerned with placing the country in a state of military preparedness.

In my investigation of the Mooney case I have kept these facts well in mind and proceeded on the theory that an unwarranted attack upon labor leaders, with a premeditated and deliberate intention to injure and discredit union labor generally.

The alternative plan was to proceed secretly, with but two or three men, and make no move that would attract attention.

It was therefore decided to work secretly.

I had at this time two trusted assistants in San Francisco, and to these I confided my plan of operations, leaving, however, the execution of the details very largely to their own judgment. \* \* \* It was absolutely necessary to the success of the operation to install a dictaphone in the office of the district attorney, Mr. Charles M. Fickert. This task was a seemingly impossible one, owing to the fact that Fickert keeps himself barricaded behind double-locked doors on the fourth floor of the Hall of Justice, in a private office to which only one other man has the keys.

The full details as to how this dictaphone was finally installed will probably never be divulged, as no good purpose could be served by a recital of the facts, interesting as they are. Some idea of the difficulties involved will be gained when it is stated that more than two months of careful and clever work were required before the installation was complete and the machine in actual operation.

Fickert's office in the Hall of Justice is a very large room in the southwest corner of the building, on the topmost floor. (See diagram, Exhibit A.) It is lighted by two arched windows, one overlooking Portsmouth Square to the west, the other fronting Merchant Street on the south. The district attorney's desk is in the extreme southwest corner of the room, between the two windows. Besides the desk, the room contains a large oblong table; otherwise there is little furniture. On floor and table, in picturesque disarray, are countless exhibits alleged to relate to the activities of the I. W. W.'s, the Mooney defendants, and other reputed agitators and dynamiters.

For dictaphone purposes the location was by no means an ideal one. Rumbling teams and street cars, tooting automobiles, the shouts of Chinese children playing around the Robert Louis Stevenson fountain in the park opposite—these and other sounds from Kearney Street ascended and mingled with the voices of those conversing within the room. The room itself was about 25 by 30 feet, and when conversations were held in a low voice at some distance from the transmitter the results attained were not always satisfactory.

Considerable experiment was thus required to adjust the delicate microphone to the peculiar and somewhat baffling conditions. After trying out various combinations of batteries, resistance coils, amplifying valves, and receivers, and making several novel improvements never before attempted in similar lines of work, a final satisfactory adjustment was at last achieved.

I know of no better way to present the mass of valuable information secured through the use of this machine than to incorporate the full transcript in the body of this report. It is lengthy, but at the same time it is illuminating; and any digest, paraphrase, or abridgment would perhaps fail to convey either the true atmosphere of the district attorney's office or the full significance of the record itself. In view of the importance of the case, it is not believed that further apologies are necessary for this introduction of what in other circumstances might justly be considered an unconscionably long and detailed account of miscellaneous and not always interesting conversations.

In order to complete these prefatory remarks, it might be well to add that the conversations in the following transcript were all overheard by two or more persons, usually by three, though sometimes by more than three. For the sake of clearness it has been thought best to insert brief notes of explanation wherever necessary; these are invariably given in brackets. Wherever the conversation was obscure or inaudible, the fact is noted. In the telephone conversations, both voices could usually be heard. Sometimes, however, the microphone failed to transmit the voice at the far end of the line.

Now, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I submit the above as a few of the reasons why I have called the Secretary of Labor crooked. The above is indisputable evidence of the fact that the Secretary of Labor, wholly unauthorized by law, has been spending the people's money assisting an anarchist convicted of foul murder to escape the penalty of the law. He has even



gone to the extreme of having one of his highly paid employees to take with him a bunch of thugs to California and install a dictagraph machine in the district attorney's office there to help criminals to escape. As I said before, any man who will help anarchists in the United States is crooked, especially if he is a Cabinet officer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of laws against alien anarchists: For the enforcement of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof, including salaries and expenses of officers, clerks, and employees in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, per diem in lieu of subsistence, supplies, rentals, deportation expenses, and all other expenses incident to the enforcement of said laws, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$750,000.

Mr. RAKER. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 33, line 9, strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the testimony in this matter appears on pages 692 to 699 of the printed hearings before the committee. It will be seen that the officer in charge of this work asked Congress to give \$1,000,000 for this purpose. I think anyone who has read the hearings and gone into the matter will appreciate fully the reasons for the appropriation. One of the extra costs borne by the Government now is because of the want of efficient assistance both in making the original arrest, the transportation to the place of hearing, the detention and final deportation abroad of these anarchists. The mode and method of the hearing is specified in the record. Anyone who examines the record of the 249 anarchists who were deported on the *Buford* on the 21st day of December, 1919, will find that the men were not only confessed anarchists but were proven anarchists by the record, and that the majority of them not only believed in the destruction of this Government but they believed in the assassination of public officials, and they believed in the unlawful destruction of life and property. The written record is there in each instance. Myself and others read part of those records.

There is no need of camouflaging the fact that the evidence is not clear and conclusive against many others who have been apprehended by the Government.

The money will not be expended unless it is actually used, but the Government is expending a large amount of money by holding these men at Ellis Island and elsewhere because of want of funds and want of means of transportation, and it ought not to be delayed for a moment.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. There is a good deal of talk about these men promising to come back here. Are our laws such that they are not to be embarrassed by that?

Mr. RAKER. If the law is enforced, by proper picture and record and finger prints and examination on return, they can not come back under our law. But the criminal may disguise himself in many ways and he might and possibly could get back. The evidence taken before the committee shows that there is but little obstruction to men coming in on the Canadian border because of the want of guards and the want of machinery. From the testimony presented to the committee in the last two weeks by capable men, men from the southern border of the Mexican line, the same state of facts exists.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALSH). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. There is no obstruction in a way to keep men from coming over the Mexican border, and we need more patrols on both borders.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. How many are there at Ellis Island awaiting deportation?

Mr. RAKER. I am not able to give the gentleman the number at this date.

Mr. FESS. I understood from the Department of Justice that there probably would be 6,000 people subject to such punishment already determined.

Mr. RAKER. They have already investigated and have before them the record that will bring it up to between 5,000 and 6,000. I want to say to the committee that they will not spend a dollar

unless it is absolutely necessary. Let us not hamper the department when they are working faithfully—the Department of Justice and Bureau of Naturalization are properly handling this subject in all of its phases, to the end that the men may be properly disposed of after full hearing on their cases.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BOX. What is there to prevent the deported anarchists from disguising themselves and returning as seamen, and then deserting and gaining the interior?

Mr. RAKER. Nothing. I answered that to a question by the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. Fess. I say it is a misfortune; but it is true. They can disguise themselves and come back, as the gentleman suggests. There should be a more stringent examination and inspection. It is difficult to prevent them from coming in now because they have not the force of inspectors.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman recall the testimony taken before the committee to the effect that it is easy to come across the Mexican border, and that Emma Goldman and Berkman were urged to go into Mexico and carry on their propaganda?

Mr. RAKER. That is a fact; they can come and do come across the Mexican border by thousands. One man said he had in his employ 150 men, and only 1 of them had come across the border legally and had a certificate. So you see that we have a disadvantage surrounding us all the time, and we ought to provide sufficient funds so they may be prevented to the further end that where the public officers in this country have followed the law and made the arrests, trials have been had, evidence conclusive that if these men are anarchists and bomb throwers, they can be deported. The evidence in many cases shows actually that the men have tried to destroy property and lives, and we should provide a sufficient fund whereby they can be deported, and whereby those who can not be deported shall be promptly and speedily prosecuted. That this service finding this evidence shall turn it over to the Attorney General's office, and vice versa from the Attorney General's office to the Labor Bureau and the Bureau of Immigration, to the end that the men may be deported if found here in violation of the law. I say it is penny-wise and pound-foolish to talk about economy in a thing that is absolutely necessary. It is a question actually before you. It is a live question; there is no theory about it. It is right here, and the evidence has been clear and conclusive upon these subjects, and I ask of the committee now, in passing upon this matter, that they give the department sufficient funds to employ help, so that the law may be enforced. These men are already arrested in the usual way, and a hearing must be had by the immigration inspectors. That case is transferred and sent to the Bureau of Immigration. Then it goes to the law department and is examined—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I desire to say that the three items under the title in this bill "Immigration Service" represent in full the amount which the Director General of Immigration can use at present. These items come up as deficiencies. It is not possible in this deficiency bill to undertake to set up an additional border patrol service nor to enact laws, no matter how badly needed. These are the sums necessary to cover deficiencies and to go on with the deportation work to the end of the fiscal year. These are the sums asked for during the hearings before the committee.

Mr. RAKER. They asked for a million on the first sum and \$150,000 where the committee gave them \$100,000. So the committee in both instances reduced the amounts, one \$250,000 and the other \$50,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The service can do with the money offered. It is satisfactory to them. We ought not to make unnecessary appropriations for work that can only be guessed at when further deficiency appropriations can be made later if needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Deportation of aliens under the laws regulating immigration: For the expenses of deporting to the countries whence they came, as specified in the immigration act of February 5, 1917, of alien public charges and others ordered deported under the laws regulating immigration since July 31, 1914, including conveyance to the frontier or seaboard for deportation, transportation charges when payable by the United States under the terms of existing law, including maintenance expenses, expenses of attendance and per diem in lieu of subsistence, and all incidental expenses in connection therewith, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$100,000.



Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 21, after the word "labor" strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Caminetti, appeared before the committee and urged that \$150,000 be authorized for this service. That will be found on page 699 of the hearings. This service ought to be given the full amount to the end that the law may be carried out, and I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS.

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, special agents, and employees, and for their transportation; experts and temporary assistance for field service outside of the District of Columbia, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$8 per day; traveling expenses of officers and employees, purchase of reports and materials for reports and bulletins of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and for subvention to "International Association for Labor Legislation," and necessary expenses connected with representation of the United States Government therein, \$12,250.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not a deficiency; it is new legislation and is not authorized by law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. They are not authorized to have a per diem and traveling expense of \$8 a day, and all such new provisions as that doubling such allowances. There is no law for that.

Mr. GOOD. They come under the general provision of law.

Mr. BLANTON. The only law we have ever had authorizing per diem was as riders on appropriation bills, and then it fixes it at \$4 a day. This is a change of law. It is certainly new legislation and it is not a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the act of March 4, 1913, provides that the Bureau of Labor shall hereafter be known as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor shall hereafter be known as the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, and that all of the powers and duties theretofore possessed by the Commissioner of Labor shall be retained and exercised by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

Section 948, prescribing the duties of the commissioner, provides that it shall be the duty of the commissioner also to ascertain and report the effect of the customs laws, and so forth, and that he shall also establish a system of reports by which, at intervals of not more than two years, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman cite the Chair to any authority for paying a per diem in lieu of subsistence?

Mr. GOOD. There is no per diem in lieu of subsistence provided for in the bill. That is simply a limitation—that they shall not pay more than \$8 a day for wages.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will read lines 23 and 24, on page 33, he will see that it provides for per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. BLANTON. At \$4 per day, and this is certainly a change of law, as it provides \$8 per day.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 provides:

That the heads of executive departments and other Government establishments shall authorize and prescribe per diem rates of allowance not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence to persons engaged in field work or traveling on business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty, when not otherwise fixed by law. For the fiscal year 1916 and annually thereafter estimates of appropriations from which per diem allowances are to be paid shall specifically state the rates of such allowances.

The section just read is permanent law, and has been so construed by the Auditor and Comptroller of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks, in view of the language read by the gentleman from Iowa, that a per diem in lieu of subsistence is authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. But where a certain amount of money is appropriated under a law of that kind, is it a deficiency to come in in an item like this and ask for a new amount, when there is no deficit whatever?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say that this item is for the rest of the current fiscal year, and therefore is a deficiency.

Mr. BLANTON. But I quote a very eminent authority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who, in a point of order which he made the other day that the matter in question was not a deficiency, asserted that it devolves on the chairman in charge of the bill to show that it is a deficiency where a point of order is made that it is not a deficiency, and the chairman has not shown that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATURALIZATION SERVICE.

For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Labor, of examiners, interpreters, clerks, and stenographers, for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, provided for by the act approved June 29, 1906, as amended by the act approved March 4, 1913 (Stat. L., vol. 37, p. 736), and May 9, 1918 (Stat. L., vol. 40, pp. 542-548, inclusive), including not to exceed \$35,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia from February 1, 1919, and for their actual necessary traveling expenses while absent from their official stations, including street car fare on official business at official stations, together with per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for such per diem, together with actual necessary traveling expenses of officers and employees of the Bureau of Naturalization in Washington while absent on official duty outside of the District of Columbia; telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in offices outside of the District of Columbia; carrying into effect section 13 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 600), as amended by the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 765), and in accordance with the provisions of the sundry civil act of June 12, 1917; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpoenaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation shall be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, \$100,000: Provided, That no part of this sum shall be expended for or in connection with the training or education of aliens for citizenship until the arrearage of work connected with the granting of citizenship to aliens shall have been disposed of.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not a deficiency, that it is not authorized by law, and that it is new legislation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the object for which this appropriation is sought is authorized by law. There is an estimate from the Secretary for a deficiency. Part of this appropriation is to carry into effect the provisions of law where the officers of the courts must do the actual work of naturalization. The act of June 29, 1906, gives to the United States circuit and district courts now existing, or which may hereafter be established by the Congress, and so forth, the naturalization jurisdiction of the courts therein specified, and shall extend only to alien residents within the respective judicial district.

Then the provisions of the act establishing the bureau (section 961 of the Revised Statutes) provide that the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization shall be divided into two bureaus, to be known hereafter as the Bureau of Immigration and the Bureau of Naturalization, and the title "Chief of the Division of Naturalization and assistant chief" shall be Commissioner of Naturalization and Deputy Commissioner of Naturalization, and that in the absence of the Commissioner of Naturalization the deputy commissioner shall be the administrative officer.

Section 953 provides—

That the designation of the Bureau of Immigration, Department of Commerce, shall be changed to the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, which said bureau, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, in addition to the duties that are now provided by law, shall have charge of all matters concerning the naturalization of aliens. It shall be the duty of said bureau to provide for the use of the bureaus of immigration stationed throughout the United States books of record wherein the Commissioner of Immigration shall cause a register to be made—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if the citation of the various statutes contained in this paragraph are the authorities for the things it proposes—

Mr. GOOD. They are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like also to ask the gentleman from Iowa to discuss the language of the proviso as to whether or not that is not new legislation.

Mr. GOOD. That is simply a limitation on the amount that can be expended. The limitation simply provides "that no part of this sum shall be expended for or in connection with the training or education of aliens for citizenship until the arrearage of work connected with the granting of citizenship to aliens shall have been disposed of." At the present time a great deal of this appropriation is being expended for what is known as "Americanization," and the committee was of the opinion that a part of the deficiency that now exists was created because of the expenditure along this line, and therefore we placed the provision that so far as this appropriation is concerned no part of it should be expended until this work of naturalization is brought up to date.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is so plain that with the average judgment of the presiding officer he ought not to hesitate to determine a question of this kind properly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the authority cited is sufficient to warrant the language used in the paragraph, and therefore the point of order that the legislation is not authorized by existing law is overruled. The gentleman



from Iowa states that this is an appropriation to be used during the balance of the present fiscal year to carry on activities already undertaken by the department, or at least that is the understanding of the Chair, and therefore seems to be in the form of a limitation on account of the fact that before this deficiency appropriation shall be available arrearages of work in connection with the bureau shall be brought up to date, and in the view of the Chair that is a proper limitation, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the paragraph we have just passed there is a typographical error, and I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 18, strike out "1919" and insert in lieu thereof "1920."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what are these arrearages of work connected with the granting of citizenship to aliens which are regarded as of so much more importance than the instruction of the alien in citizenship before granting final papers to them?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, the testimony before the committee was that in some places like New York, where there is great congestion, the aliens have to take two citizens of the United States with them to the court in order to go through the regular prescribed form, and he might sit there all day, because they are not able to get to the ear of the court or the commissioner.

Mr. SABATH. And they are obliged to come back?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and they are obliged to come back. Now, instead of spending the money for naturalization we have commenced on a plan by this bureau of trying to cram these aliens so as to make them fit for citizenship in a day or two, a system that ought never to have been established at all, and they are spending a whole lot of money in doing that kind of work and not upon their work of naturalization. They are carrying on a kind of work that the public schools of the United States are intended to carry on. These aliens ought to go to our schools and there learn to read and write and become familiar with the Constitution instead of having somebody just before they go before the judge or the commissioner to interpret the Constitution of the United States and give them instructions as to how to answer the questions. Now, it was the opinion of the committee that while there were thousands of these aliens who were entitled to citizenship, this money should be spent in hiring clerks to help naturalize them and stop the work of education done in this bureau until the arrearage of naturalization work was brought up to date.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is the effect of this provision, however, to deny the opportunity of full instruction to those who want to be citizens in the principles of the Constitution, or has it reference only to those who are really prepared to become citizens and who are delayed in the procedure of obtaining final citizenship?

Mr. GOOD. Every city in the United States, every village, hamlet, and municipality furnishes public-school facilities. They can go to the public schools, and this is to stop another system of schools until they have performed what was the intention of Congress, which is to naturalize the citizens who were entitled to immediate naturalization, and those who have not availed themselves of the public schools of the States can wait until they have availed themselves of those privileges.

Mr. BRIGGS. The reason I asked in this connection is I understood the Bureau of Naturalization was establishing now a condition that certificates of proficiency or the completion of a course for citizenship shall be presented from some public school or other educational institution before aliens will be recommended for their final papers. Would the language of this provision interfere with the carrying out of that provision?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRIGGS. I ask for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman for two additional minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. I hope it will have an effect of stopping a whole lot of this foolishness that has been going on and the useless expenditure of money, duplicating what the States and the cities are spending the taxpayers' money of those places for.

Mr. BRIGGS. I am not speaking about the duplication of the work. I am speaking of what the States and cities are doing in this way, in giving aliens a course in civil government, so that when they come up before the courts and say that they are attached to the principles of the Constitution they know what the principles of the Constitution are.

Mr. GOOD. This does not take a citizen out of the night school or anywhere else.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does it interfere with the requirement that they shall have a certificate of knowledge of civil government before they shall be regarded as properly ready for citizenship?

Mr. GOOD. It does not change existing law at all. It simply directs the officer to spend the money as was intended.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. SABATH. To strike out the last two words.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have had no chance or opportunity to examine the evidence that has been adduced by the committee on this appropriation, and especially as to the provision in this appropriation, but I have heard the chairman of the committee state that a great deal of this money that has been formerly appropriated for the naturalization service has been expended for educational purposes in schools. I was under the impression that only a small part of the appropriation has been expended, and that only for booklets and pamphlets that would tend to teach these aliens and familiarize them with the history of the United States and our Constitution. Therefore I desire to ask, Is it not a fact that the money has been expended only for such literature as would familiarize these people with the history of our country and the Constitution?

Mr. GOOD. No. This appropriation is not available for the publication of or the sending out of pamphlets and books. There is a separate fund out of which such expenditures are made. But what they do out of this is to send their examiners and inspectors all over the country to tell those in charge of the schools how to conduct their schools with regard to this class of persons. We propose to stop that.

Mr. SABATH. Out of this appropriation, can the chairman of the committee tell me how much has been expended?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Crist said it was all mixed up together and was very hard to tell. He thought possibly 25 per cent, or thereabouts, was spent for such purpose.

Mr. SABATH. I have met Mr. Crist, and he is rendering splendid help in sending out publications to the public schools of the United States.

Mr. GOOD. He is very enthusiastic in his work, and when a man becomes an enthusiast he is liable to overstep.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate that; but I did not know that any of this appropriation had been used for the purpose of paying any teachers for school rents or any such purpose. I was under the impression it had been used only for the purpose of printing these publications that should go to the hands of the school-teachers who are trying to prepare these applicants for naturalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FIRST INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

For salaries and expenses of the First Industrial Conference called by the President of the United States, including printing, personal services in the District of Columbia, payment to Pan American Union for use of its building, including light, telephone service, and all other necessary expenses, \$9,147.57.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Last Friday, I think it was, I asked the chairman of the committee, when the matter of the Public Health Service was under discussion in this bill, a question. I rather felt at the time that the chairman was a little brusque with me in his answer and intimated that as a new Member of Congress I should be entirely familiar with all the statutes of the United States and with all the governmental functions. I was very much interested in the matter under discussion in the House—the Public Health Service—because of the fact of being a physician and having some views in respect to the extension of governmental activities generally which have cropped up during the war going far beyond what I think they ought to go, and I made up my mind to obtain, if I could, a little information on the subject. I will give it to the House, as well as to the chairman of the committee, if he is not already familiar with the facts. I asked the Public Health Service a specific question and I have a specific answer from them, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,  
Washington, February 2, 1920.

The HON. CALIB R. LAYTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAYTON: In the matter of medical officers connected with the Public Health Service, I am pleased to furnish the information that there are about 2,300 physicians in the service appointed for duty



and they are all medical graduates and properly licensed to practice. The aggregate annual pay of these physicians is approximately \$4,601,000. This is exclusive of nurses, attendants, etc.  
Respectfully,

J. C. PERRY,  
Acting Surgeon General.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I, as one Member of this House, object to the extension of a public service of this character. Here we have on the pay rolls of the United States a number of licensed physicians drawing salaries that are nearly 50 per cent of all the physicians we had for 4,000,000 troops in the war. When you take into account those who are dead and need no physicians; when you take into account the comparatively small number of casualties that we had, and those who came back here by the hundreds of thousands who are stronger and better than they were before they enlisted, I say that this number of physicians is a fraud upon the taxpayers of this country, unless it be the intention of the Congress to substitute Government physicians and surgeons for all those engaged in civil practice.

As the chairman of the committee has just said, there are civil functions that ought not to be interfered with. I think he made that statement a moment ago. So in this case the physicians of this country ought to be allowed to take care of these matters in a civil way.

I am not opposed, Mr. Chairman, to a national Public Health Service. The matter of the public health is one that involves well-defined principles of economics, as well as human happiness and well-being. What I am opposed to is its extension to abnormal and unjustifiable proportions which usurp the rights as well as the duties of the States, and interferes with physicians and surgeons in their civil occupation. Extended, all these various functions inaugurated under the stress of war simply means the gradual nationalization of every civil function now performed by men and women in their individual capacity and acting upon their own initiative. This tendency is well revealed in every direction, and is known to all thoughtful men, but there is a strange paralysis of action in opposition to this tendency. There are many of these governmental activities, too many in fact for me to mention in the presence of this House, who are more familiar with them than I am. In addition to the Public Health Service and its extension to a point where, after the war is over, there are still employed 2,500 physicians at a salary aggregating \$4,601,000, I desire to call the attention of the House to the matter of national education. No one denies that education is the very foundation of intelligent citizenship, and essential to the preservation of our Government, where the people themselves rule under a democratic form. In this matter there is an increasing encroachment upon the several States of the Union. Federal control is extending itself to such a degree that the people of the various States, whose duty it is to provide for education themselves, are gradually losing their initiative, and growing more and more to lean on the paternal arm of the Federal Government. Many of these estimable people are seeking more and more to broaden the scope of Federal control. Most of them are ignorant of the consequences. Some of them are secret disciples of nationalism and internationalism, of which the foundation stone is socialism. I am opposed to this tendency in every form, except where it be a clear and indubitable national necessity. All of these various activities should be reserved to the States and their people, where it is possible, in order that they may become capable citizens because they have been compelled to grapple with and work out their own problems. Paternalism is inherently enervating and does not make for capable, robust citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to ask him whether there was any authority of law for the calling of this conference, and whether this appropriation is based upon any existing statute?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am not going to raise a point of order, but I want it as a matter of information.

Mr. GOOD. No. There is no law authorizing the President to constitute this conference. The conference was constituted by the President and the amount carried in the bill is just the exact amount of the expenditures, or the amount of the bills that have accumulated because of that conference.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Who reported these expenditures to the committee?

Mr. GOOD. As I recall, the President turned this whole matter over to the Department of Labor, to make the arrangements, and authorized them to incur the indebtedness. I think it was while Mr. Roosevelt was President that Congress enacted a law which absolutely prohibited the creation of a conference of this kind or a commission of this kind, and provided that no money should be expended for that purpose unless duly authorized by law. That statute is still on the statute books. But this conference was created, and this is an actual deficiency, although created in violation of that provision of the statute. But the committee felt that the proper thing to do was to bring it before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SECOND INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

For salaries and expenses of the second industrial conference called by the President to meet December 1, 1919, including reporting, printing and binding, rent, traveling expenses, and contingent and other miscellaneous expenses, \$12,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, in view of the statement made by the chairman.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this conference is now at work. From the reports that come out I understand the conference is really doing effective work. The Hon. Samuel W. McCall, former governor of Massachusetts and formerly a Member of this body, is a member of this conference, and men of that character have been brought together to study some of these questions. The Department of Labor estimates that it would cost more than is carried here—as I recall, \$25,000. Mr. McCall and Mr. Rosenwald, another member of the conference, came to us and said they could get along with \$12,000. As I recall, they are not receiving any salaries. This is just for the actual expenses. I believe that just at this time—and I think I voice the sentiment of the entire committee—when we see the unrest throughout the United States, we feel if \$12,000 is expended in this way by men who are brought together from all parts of the United States to study the industrial situation, it will be money well expended. I think if the gentleman will look over the names of the men whom the President has called together on this occasion, he will concede that we ought to congratulate the President in taking the step, even though no authority exists for the conference. At least, the expense of stenographers and clerks ought to be paid, so that the conference can work in an efficient manner. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not raise the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is time to stop spending the people's money for these conferences. The gentleman mentions the name of a former governor of Massachusetts, a former Member of this House. Well, he is traveling somewhat upon reflected glory at the present time, and while he may think he is doing a lot of good work, and although a lot of these other cranks that are collocated together under the name of conferences and industrial commissions and committees may all be obsessed with the idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts, yet they are all costing money, and it is time to show a little spirit of retrenchment. [Applause.]

Talk about unrest! Of course there is going to be unrest if we have conferences called to keep these problems stirred up and stewed up all the time. [Applause.] They are no nearer solution after the conference dissolves and they go back to their respective homes than they were before they undertook it.

The first industrial conference came to a deadlock and was a failure. Each side blamed the other. I do not believe that this second one is going to get very much further. I submit to the chairman of the committee that it is time for Congress to express its view upon this matter. Are we going to continue indefinitely these war powers and this war legislation and these war conferences? This conference was called—the first one—probably through an interpretation of the war power, without any specific authority. Now, the time for these things has passed, and I submit, unless we give specific authority, the law of 1909 which governs matters of this sort ought to be respected. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether this sum



of money has been incurred, and, if so, in what way the indebtedness has been incurred?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose a part of this has been incurred. The estimate made by the executive secretary and approved by the Secretary of Labor provides for traveling expenses for members of the conference, \$6,000; traveling and per diem expenses of witnesses to the conference, \$1,000; secretaries, \$2,000; clerical and stenographic assistants, \$2,000; printing, postage, and sundry expenses, \$1,000. I hope the gentleman will not make a point of order. I realize that there ought to be legislation along this line, but I think the committee and Congress might be criticized at this time if this appropriation is not made, and for that reason the work should proceed.

Mr. WALSH. Well, the gentleman should not urge that as the reason—because Congress might be criticized. It might be criticized because it did make an appropriation of \$12,000 for this purpose.

Mr. GOOD. It might justly be criticized. We have already appropriated for one of these conferences—the coal conference. We have already carried an item in the bill for that, and that has been passed. We have given an appropriation for that conference, and I submit to the gentleman that we ought at least to give this conference a fair trial.

Mr. WALSH. How many of these conferences are there now at large? We have had the coal conference and the industrial conference, and has there not been recently some international allied conference operating down here, occupying Government buildings?

Mr. GOOD. That was a conference of labor, provided for by the League of Nations, and that conference was called because Congress passed a resolution directing the President to call it and providing that he should not appoint commissioners unless—

Mr. WALSH. Oh, probably that would have been called if we had not directed the President to call it. We did not direct him to call the coal conference.

Mr. GOOD. The coal conference was called, as the gentleman will remember, when Congress was in recess, and that was called as the result of an agreement between the coal operators and the coal miners.

Mr. WALSH. That is the conference about which great promises have been held out of public benefit to consumers of coal as the result of their operations?

Mr. GOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. I predict that the public benefit will vanish into thin air. Instead of the consumers of coal paying less for fuel as the result of that conference and its operations they will be paying more. There is no authority of law for this industrial conference, and really the expenditure that has been incurred ought to come out of the funds of the officer responsible for calling it.

But in view of the plea of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], who is convinced because a former governor of Massachusetts happens to be a member of it, which fact is not even persuasive with me, that some benefit may come, I am going to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that in the preceding paragraph we have appropriated \$9,100 and more, part of which the provision says is to pay the Pan American Union for the use of this building down here during that first conference. Now that building is maintained here in the city of Washington partly at the expense of the people of this Government. I understood that conference was called in the interests of the other people who are interested in the Pan American Building, the same as the people of the United States, and why we should be called upon to pay out \$9,100 for the use of that building a few days in the interests of the people of the countries involved, I can not see. Now we are asked to pay out \$12,000 more.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, there is no rent paid for the use of that building. That language is submitted in the estimate, but it is for the heating and the expense of lighting the building during the conference.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think he ought to draw the bills that he brings in here in such words that they will mean what they say, so as not to mislead us?

Mr. GOOD. This was the estimate made by the Department of Labor, and they have the entire charge of the expenditure of these funds. We went into the matter in the hearing, and it was made very clear that this money was not for the use of the building. The very question that the gentleman has raised here was raised there, and it was explained that not a penny of this was for the use of the building. It was just for the heat and light.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I applauded every word said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I think I was the only man in the House who did applaud him. I want to make my applause good, because my economy is more than lip economy, and I make the point of order against this paragraph that it is not authorized by law, is not a deficiency, and that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order against the first paragraph on page 36. Can the gentleman from Iowa cite the Chair to any authorization of law?

Mr. GOOD. There is no authority of law for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### LEGISLATIVE.

House Office Building: For maintenance, including miscellaneous items, and for all necessary services, \$19,505.20.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question: What is the meaning of the words "including miscellaneous items, and for all necessary services," in line 9?

Mr. GOOD. It includes all expenditures for the maintenance of the House Office Building except heating the building. Everything necessary for the maintenance of the building except the heating is included.

Mr. BARBOUR. I should like to ask the chairman, further, if that contemplates the expenditure of any money for the purpose of eradicating the mice, cockroaches, and other vermin that infest the House Office Building? [Applause.] I ask that question for the purpose of calling attention to what I consider a very deplorable condition existing there.

Mr. GOOD. It would be paid out of this fund. The whole question of superintending that work is under the jurisdiction of the House Office Building Commission.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then I think something ought to be done to jack up this House Office Building Commission, or the superintendent, or whoever it is that is responsible for those conditions. I have got a collection of bugs in my office that I dare say will compare with anything in the Smithsonian Institution. [Laughter.] They have ruined a large supply of stationery which I recently received and which was charged up to my stationery account.

Mr. BLANTON. I will ask the gentleman whether there is any bug juice over there? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARBOUR. I have had the superintendent of the office building spray a solution, supposed to be an insect destroyer, three or four times around my office, and afterwards the bugs seemed to be larger than they were before.

Mr. JUUL. They got fat on it.

Mr. BARBOUR. They have even eaten the covers off the books; and I think it is time that somebody who is responsible for this condition sat up and took notice of what is going on over there. There are enough employees sitting around in the House Office Building warming chairs and apparently doing nothing but drawing their salaries, so that, it seems to me, they could put things in a somewhat decent and livable condition there.

Mr. KING. Perhaps if there was anything fit to eat furnished in the House Office Building restaurant the gentleman's books would not be disturbed by the cockroaches. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARBOUR. It has been some time since I endeavored to eat anything in the House Office Building restaurant.

Another thing, while I am on my feet and if I am in order, I would like to call attention to the fact that while there are several men on duty over there wearing the uniforms and badges of policemen it is a common occurrence for things to be stolen out of the House Office Building. It seems to me that if some of the fellows wearing those uniforms would get out of their chairs occasionally and patrol the halls of the office building this condition might not exist. I think it is a crying shame that the House Office Building is in the condition in which it is. I make these remarks for the purpose of calling the matter to the attention of the House, in the hope that something will sometime be done to remedy the conditions existing there. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, here are \$19,505.20 appropriated for the House Office Building. If I am not misinformed, part of this money goes to maintain the restaurant over there. I think it is a long while since the Members having their offices there have sampled any of the food in the House Office Building restaurant.

Mr. GOOD. Nothing in this fund goes to the restaurant.



Mr. JUUL. We are paying for housing, light, and heat for that restaurant. I take it that comes out of some fund. Now, some committee somewhere in this House ought to be responsible for a thorough clean-up. If I can find the item in this bill that pays for anything for that restaurant over there I want to move to strike it out. The poor girls and other employees who have to go there to eat are charged double and treble prices for stuff that is not fit to set before a human being. The people who run that restaurant have rent free, light free, and heat free, and they furnish wretched stuff to eat. They charge exorbitant prices for it, and we as Congressmen let them fool with us and do us.

Then, after we have let them charge us exorbitant prices for poor food, insufficient food, and poor service, we go out and kick against the restaurants on the outside because they do the same thing.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman received a communication from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING]?

Mr. JUUL. I am sorry that we have not a lot more of Kings to straighten this thing out. Now that I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word more.

Mr. GOOD. There is nothing in the bill pertaining to the restaurants. The gentleman must speak to the House Office Commission that has charge of it. There is nothing carried in this bill that pertains to the restaurants.

Mr. JUUL. I want to say that over in the Senate restaurant an entirely different atmosphere prevails. They have different food, different service, and the prices are moderate. I think it is high time that we quit this foolishness and that somebody or other should look after it and give us decent service.

Mr. GOOD. The circumstances in regard to the restaurant of the Senate are different from that here. The Senate restaurant is run under an arrangement that the Government will pay any deficit in operation. Here neither the restaurant on the House side of the Capitol nor the restaurant in the House Office Building is any deficit taken care of by an appropriation.

Mr. JUUL. How can there be a deficit when they do not pay for heat, they do not pay for light, they do not pay any rent, and they charge exorbitant prices and furnish poor food. [Laughter.] How can there be a deficit?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman will have to take that up with the House Office Commission. I am not on the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JUUL. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUUL. I will.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the House restaurant in the office building is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Building and Grounds.

Mr. JUUL. I want to say that there is as much difference between the restaurant in the House Office Building and that of the Senate as between night and day. I think we are soft in the top story to let them treat us the way we are treated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The only way for the gentleman from Illinois is to take it up with the proper parties having jurisdiction.

Mr. JUUL. It is a case where you find the finger pointing in two directions. When you try to point your finger to the guilty party, it is always over in the next county. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I notice that this item calls for the expenditure for miscellaneous items. I would like to ask, as a matter of information, what the deficiency is for?

Mr. GOOD. It involves miscellaneous items, as the word indicates. Occasionally it is necessary to change all the locks on the doors—that is, to change the cylinders of the locks.

Mr. DENISON. Why is that necessary?

Mr. GOOD. Because there are certain master keys made and somebody gets possession of them. Some Member may lose his key and some one may find it. When he goes out of Congress he may give the key to a clerk in his office, and after a while a great many keys are out and Members are having things taken from their rooms. Mr. Woods has informed the committee that it has always been necessary, after the lapse of two or three years, to change the cylinders, and that involves an expense alone of \$2,993. There are many items of that kind. Then there are changes made in the rooms, some painting is done, all maintenance items. It is a very large building, and the expense is not very large when you consider the size of the building that must be maintained. Here comes a complaint like the complaint made by the gentleman from California, that in many cases there is not enough work done. The

complaint of the gentleman from California is that there is not sufficient work done in cleaning up the offices.

Mr. BARBOUR. If the gentleman will yield, my opinion is—and I have made some investigation—that the people in charge do not follow up and see that the work is done. They sit around in chairs, and it would do them good to get up and find out if the charwomen and others employed to do the work really do it.

Mr. GOOD. Those persons who sit at the elevators have nothing to do with cleaning up. They have their hands full if they run the elevators and run them properly.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who has control of the char work? Whoever it is, he is not doing his duty.

Mr. GOOD. Neither the elevator men nor the police are under the control of the superintendent; but if the gentleman has a complaint, I suggest that he take the matter up first with the superintendent of the building, and then if he does not get a result go to the commission.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who is the commission?

Mr. GOOD. The Speaker of the House, the ex-Speaker [Mr. CLARK of Missouri], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not to exceed \$1 per thousand, \$8,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, after line 19, add the following:

"For payment of Peter F. Tague, in the contested-election case of Tague against Fitzgerald, ordered and recommended by Committee on Elections No. 2, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowance to the following contestant and contestee for expenses incurred by them in the contested-election case audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 1: Victor L. Berger, \$2,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I want to ask the chairman whether or not he thinks it is right for the people of the United States to pay a disloyalist \$2,000 of their money for trying to break into Congress when he knew he was not qualified, when he knew he was disloyal to his flag in war time, when he knew that he was preaching propaganda to disorganize and dismember the Government? Are we going to pay him \$2,000 additional after he has drawn a salary for months and months, and also drawn for his clerk hire and his secretary's hire and his office expenses?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the law provides that in a contested-election case, where the election of any person who has a certificate is contested, there shall be paid to the contestee and to the contestant a sum not to exceed \$2,000 for the expenses of the contest. This sum has nothing to do with the recent action of the House in denying Mr. Berger a seat. In the election in the fall of 1918 Mr. Berger was a candidate from the fifth congressional district from the State of Wisconsin. He was declared elected, and he came to the House with a certificate of election. He presented it. His election was contested by another candidate. He had a right under the law to be heard. He had all of the rights that any person would have under similar circumstances. It is not for the Committee on Appropriations to say whether or not because it believes a man is entitled to a seat or is not entitled to a seat the law shall be enforced. The Committee on Appropriations in reporting this item had but one duty to perform, and that was to obey the law, and the man or the class of men who would turn a man out of Congress because he was not a good, loyal citizen of the Republic, and then in turning him out would themselves refuse to abide by the law by not given him the money which the law says he shall have in my opinion would be but little better than the man who violates the law in the first instance. The law is that Mr. Berger is entitled to his expenses in that contest. He was entitled to a hearing, and the Committee on Appropriations, without any division at all upon the subject, was in favor of following the law and in favor of the law being enforced. This appropriation is in obedience to the statutes of the United States. We have no discretion in the matter. This item was certified unanimously by the Committee on Elections that heard the case. It bears the indorsement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER], who asked that the appropriation be made.



Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the law and the rules of this House provide that whenever a man who holds, presumably, the qualifications of a Representative comes here upon a contested election and that contest is heard, he shall be paid a sum of not to exceed \$2,000 for his expenses. The law nowhere provides and the rules of this House nowhere provide that one who is disloyal, who has no right to a seat in the House of Representatives, who comes here and who is heard only on a question of his loyalty to his flag, shall be paid anything. The very moment that the Sixty-sixth Congress met, Victor L. Berger appeared here on the floor of the House and asked to be sworn in, and at that moment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALINGER] offered a resolution to the effect that that man was disloyal to his flag and his country in time of war, and that he had no right to claim a seat in this House, in the first instance. That was the question which was passed upon before the committee, not a contested-election case. It was the question of Victor L. Berger's loyalty to his country and to his flag in time of war.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I have not time now to yield. That was the question upon which evidence was heard, that was the question which the committee spent days and weeks in hearing testimony on, filling a thick book with hundreds of pages of evidence. It was not the question of a contested-election case. There is no law authorizing this payment. If it were a contested-election case, immediately upon the deciding that Victor L. Berger was not entitled to a seat, Mr. Carney would have been sworn in here as a Representative in Congress. Was Mr. Carney sworn in? No. Was Mr. Berger sworn in? No; because the committee found that he was disloyal. My friend from Iowa [Mr. GOON], the great economist chairman of the great Republican Committee on Appropriations of this House, comes in and in effect says he wants to pacify Mr. Berger by handing over \$2,000.

Mr. GOOD. I have said nothing of the kind.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the meaning of the gentleman's words.

Mr. GOOD. It is not the meaning of my words, and my words can not be construed in any such way.

Mr. BLANTON. Every Member of this House has a right to construe the acts of individuals and the English language in the way in which it appears to him reasonable, and I want to say it appears to my mind reasonable that this is an effort to pacify Mr. Berger and to pacify the thousands of disloyal socialists of his district who tried to send him here and tried to force this House to take him, to gulp him down, however bitter and poisonous the dose was.

Mr. GOOD. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of 21 members. My recollection is that every member upon it voted against seating Mr. Berger. Not a single member of that committee raised any question at any time with regard to our obligation in this matter. The whole expense was involved in determining in a lawful way, as the House I hope will always proceed to determine, the question of the right to a seat on the floor of this House. It was to determine whether or not Mr. Berger was entitled to sit here.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. And, Mr. Chairman, not a single one of those 21 members of the Appropriations Committee has ever voted against giving all of these fine cedar boxes, these fine oak boxes, and these fine pine boxes that my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has been drawing each year for 40 years and that have been allotted to me and every other Member of Congress ever since I have been here, notwithstanding that we have no excuse whatever for taking these gifts at the expense of the people, and we ought to stop such waste.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that it is not authorized by law; it is not a deficiency, and it is new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have not the floor, but I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. In order that the Record may be kept straight, I want to say that the \$2,000, as I think the House understands, is expenditure made in the inquiry respecting Mr. Berger's right to a seat when he first was elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress. After Mr. Berger was thrown out he went back and was again a candidate, and was again denied a seat without any investigation, because the Committee on Elections, after a thorough in-

vestigation, had determined the question of fact to their satisfaction. I have no doubt that the appropriation ought to be made.

Mr. BLANTON. But the hearing was not on the contest; it was on the matter of his loyalty and his qualifications to a seat in this House.

Mr. CANNON. Well, if you please, the House is making an effort to get the facts, and he had his day in court. The gentleman would not hang a dog until he had given him a chance.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but after giving him a chance and convicting him and he deserved hanging you would hang him in Illinois just the same as we would in Texas.

Mr. CANNON. We kept him out, and he is being prosecuted in the courts.

Mr. BLANTON. And we want to pacify him by giving him \$2,000—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; the gentleman is not just in that remark, and I do not think he means it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think some gentlemen are under a misapprehension as to what this item is. I do not understand that this item is for the payment of the expenses of Mr. Berger or Mr. Carney before the special committee appointed by the House to consider Mr. Berger's case. When Mr. Berger received the certificate of election under the law Mr. Carney filed notice of a contest, as I understand—I do not pretend to know very much about the facts—and testimony was taken under the contest. That contest was referred to the Committee on Elections No. 1, I assume, because that made the order. The House, however, on the opening day appointed a special committee to consider not the contested-election case but the right of Mr. Berger to be sworn in. Now, the two cases are separate. One is the contested-election case filed under the law, and under that law it is provided that the Committee on Elections which has charge of contested-election cases shall certify to the Committee on Appropriations payment or audit up to \$2,000 of the expenses of the contestant and the contestee. Apparently the Committee on Elections No. 1, to which the contest was referred, has made the proper certificate certifying the expenses of \$2,000, both to the contestant and contestee. I do not understand that that has anything to do with the contest or the investigation of the special committee of the House as to the prima facie right of Mr. Berger to be sworn in. Under the law the Committee on Appropriations has followed the certificate of the Committee on Elections No. 1 in reference to the expenses of the contest, the most of which would naturally be incurred, and probably were incurred, before Congress met at all, because the notice of contest has to be filed within, I think, 40 days of the time the certificate was issued. The reply notice has to be filed within a certain time, testimony taken, and, while I do not know what the facts are, I assume, from the certificate of the Committee on Elections, that this item is to pay for the expenses of taking testimony in the contested-election case and not in the case before the special committee.

Mr. GOOD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. In the Chair's opinion, Twentieth Statutes at Large, page 400, contain all the authorization that is necessary for such an appropriation as is carried here in the usual amount granted in contested-election cases, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reimbursement to the official stenographers to committees for amounts actually and necessarily expended by them during the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, \$700 each, \$2,800.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, not to discuss any matter that is pending but to make a few observations on another subject. I think the contention of the gentleman in reference to the payment of Berger's bill was correct under the law, because there was a contest. I think also under some conditions and circumstances there ought to be allowances of attorneys' fees and expenses of the contestant. I know it is the existing law, and I am not making any suggestion to change it, but I just want to make an observation on the subject of paying contestants in these cases attorneys' fees and expenses. If I read history aright, there was a man from South Carolina some years ago who made a habit—and the gentleman from South Carolina will bear me out as to whether I am correct or not—of contesting the election of a successful opponent in every election, with the result that he was able to maintain himself upon the attorneys' fees and expenses he realized by reason of the contest. Now, there ought to be some way in which the law can be changed to reach a condition of that kind. If a man has a real, genuine claim to a contest, I do not know that he ought to be precluded from presenting it, but this business of allowing every man disappointed by reason of the election seeking a return for the



evil that he claimed had been done to him—and this is not political and is applicable to either party—should not be encouraged, because it amounts to making a contest.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEE. I will.

Mr. ROSE. I did not happen to be in the hall at the time of the discussion with reference to the item appropriating \$2,000 to Victor Berger. I have listened to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE] has to say about contested-election cases, but as I understand the law every time that bills for expenses are presented to the committee they are scrutinized and the committee must be satisfied before an appropriation would be made, and in the case of Victor Berger—

Mr. BEE. I am not discussing the Berger case at all.

Mr. ROSE. But what I have said is that the rule followed in every election contest, if the contest has merit, the interested parties must be able to satisfy the Committee on Elections to which it was referred of the justice of the claims presented; and the committee has it in their power to refuse to recommend an appropriation for the amount for which either the contestant or contestee makes application.

Mr. BEE. For any expenses whatever?

Mr. ROSE. They have it in their power to refuse it. The Committee on Elections No. 1, of which I am a member, has refused in certain instances to pay one copper. I think power is lodged in the committee to determine the amount awarded the contending parties, not exceeding \$2,000 to contestant or contestee.

Mr. BEE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that is the very principle I have in mind. I have been keeping up for many years with these contested-election cases, and if the gentleman's committee has that power, of course it can be stopped; but I do not want anything done that will encourage the contest by these disappointed candidates, and that is the reason why I am making this statement.

Mr. ROSE. The case to which the gentleman refers was heard and considered by the committee to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it may be of interest to state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE], and also to the gentleman from Texas on my left [Mr. BLANTON], that at one time and for a long time this expense about contested elections was so rank that it became a public scandal. A fellow would start a contest and run up his bill to thousands and thousands of dollars. Finally Congress passed this law limiting it to \$2,000, which is not very much of an encouragement to an ordinary man running for Congress to come here and try to get in. So the limiting of the amount to \$2,000 did a great deal of good here.

Now, the man that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE] was talking about, from South Carolina, was named Prioleau, who claimed to be one of the old Huguenots. Anyway, he nearly pestered the life out of me when I was Speaker. He would write me a letter every three or four weeks, wanting this \$2,000. He received only two votes, and I expect, then, he repeated and voted for himself. [Laughter.] Anyhow, I suggested to the members of the Committee on Elections that that fellow ought to have snuffers put on him. [Laughter.] He came to see me. I told him he did not have any right to that \$2,000, and that if I had my way he would not get it. So the Committee on Elections came in here and reported he had no sort of claim to the money. That was five or six years ago, and nobody has heard anything from him since.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. He has stopped running.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman says that he has stopped running.

This \$2,000 limit was a very healthy performance.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And no part of the \$2,000 goes to the contestant or contestee. They must make a certificate and affidavit that this money is to be paid out to other parties before the committee will issue a certificate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as Carney is concerned, his sort of claim is res adjudicata in this House, and has been for 20 years. He did not have a shadow of a claim to a seat here, and Berger did not have a claim, and so the seat was left vacant.

Mr. BEE. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have accomplished a double purpose. I hope the country will have its attention called to the rules of the House, which are generally misunderstood. We are indebted to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for his statement in regard to the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. While I am at it, I will make a few more remarks.

The first one is that the contested-election cases grow fewer and fewer as the years go by here. In the second place, they are tried now with some semblance of justice. I saw them throw a man out here once that had 13,000 majority. Of course, that was preposterous. The credit for making these election cases a kind of lawsuit and having some decency and justice about them belongs to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.] He is the man who did it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman, if, in the last contested-election case in Alaska, the losing party to that contest, after having drawn his salary for practically two whole years, after having drawn his secretary's salary for practically two whole years, did not in addition to that draw several thousand dollars' mileage and also his \$2,000 of expenses?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course he did. I do not know anything about the figures, but I will guarantee the fact to be that both of those gentlemen from Alaska spent more than the \$2,000 allowed by Congress; and I will make one further postscript to these remarks, namely, that if Sulzer had made the same kind of an argument before the Elections Committee that he made on the floor of the House they never would have seated Wickersham. He had no business in here, anyway, on that occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have had some experience in election cases. I was chairman of one of the election committees, and found in many of the cases that the amount actually and necessarily expended on each side far exceeded \$2,000. Now, the practice has always been, at least within my long service in the House, that every chairman of the several Election Committees took care to see that the law with regard to certification of reasonableness of expenses and of sending the papers to the Committee on Appropriations was observed. The law requires not only that there shall be, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE], an affidavit showing the items of expenditure that have been made or incurred, but also there shall be verified vouchers filed with the Committee on Elections.

And I doubt whether any Elections Committee, at least within a long number of years past, has allowed any certificate to be issued or that the chairman made or issued any to be filed with the Appropriations Committee until verified vouchers were filed with the Elections Committee. There were cases in which \$2,000 was claimed by one or other of the parties to the contest, where it appeared that the amount claimed was excessive or else had not been reasonably incurred. I recall one in particular that came before my committee, where the expenditure was not necessarily incurred, and one where the contest should never have been begun, and in those cases I cut the amount down in one case from \$2,000 to \$1,200 and in another down to \$1,000. And so in some other cases reductions were made. It depends, after all, on the chairman of the Elections Committee as to what certification he will make. If, after examination of the papers submitted by the contestant or contestee and the examination of the vouchers accompanying the papers, the chairman finds the amount is reasonable and has been necessarily incurred, he simply makes the certificate and files it with the Committee on Appropriations. It is, after all, with the Elections Committee, or with the chairman of such committee, as to what amount shall be allowed. That is about the size of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous items and expenses of special and select committees, exclusive of salaries and labor, unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, for the following fiscal years:  
For 1920, \$142,000.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARNER. I do so to ascertain from the chairman of the committee just what this \$142,000 is for.

Mr. GOOD. What was the question of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GARNER. I just wanted to know what the \$142,000 was for. What necessity is there for this tremendous appropriation for the contingent expenses of the House that has brought about



this extraordinary sum as compared with anything else that we have ever had since I have been a Member of Congress?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. I think that is not true.

Mr. GARNER. I think it is, considering the length of time we have been in the Sixty-sixth Congress. It occurs to me that it is larger than anything we have ever had here before.

Mr. GOOD. The items estimated for by the Clerk of the House are as follows:

Special and select committees and committees operating under authority of resolutions, \$77,207.13.  
Telegrams, from March to June, 1920, four months, \$26,000.

That is not the telegrams of the select committees. Those are telegrams of Members of the House.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is not that an extraordinary sum as compared with other sessions of Congress?

Mr. GOOD. No. The amount has decreased considerably. It is quite large, but it is considerably less than it has been in the recent past.

Mr. GARNER. What was the \$77,000 for?

Mr. GOOD. That was for the select committees and committees operating under authority of resolutions of the House.

Mr. GARNER. Did the chairman have any hearings on the question of the details of expenditures in that particular?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The Clerk of the House came before the committee and gave us rather detailed information in regard to it.

Mr. GARNER. What are the principal items, if I may ask the chairman, so that the committee may have some slight information as to this tremendous expense that is being incurred by the various committees?

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I suggest to my friend that these committees are investigating the expenditure of infinitely larger sums of money than any Congress heretofore has appropriated for, and the expenses necessarily are larger?

Mr. GARNER. That has nothing to do with the question of whether these committees are extravagant or not. The question is whether these investigating committees that are investigating the expenditures of the Government are not quite as extravagant as the people they are investigating. The question is, Have they not been somewhat extravagant themselves?

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me, the expenditures during this war have been greater than all the expenditures, as I am informed, from the formation of the Government down to the beginning of this administration.

Mr. MADDEN. Twice as great.

Mr. CANNON. "Twice as great," the gentleman says.

Mr. GARNER. Undoubtedly; but that does not show that if the gentleman from Illinois was making an investigation he would not exercise some discretion and some restraint in spending the public funds in making that investigation. That is what I am trying to ascertain from the gentleman from Iowa now, as to what bounds of reason have governed the various special committees and expenditure committees in making these investigations. I am trying to get the items for which the expenditures were made.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Surely the gentleman will agree that in the investigation of an expenditure of funds amounting to something over \$20,000,000,000 necessarily unusual expenses are incurred.

Mr. GARNER. I merely wanted to get some detailed information. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes more, if necessary, in order to get it from the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman from Iowa is not too much disturbed by others around him, I would like to get some idea of the items for which the \$76,000 has been used.

Mr. GOOD. I am not disturbed. The \$77,000—

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman will permit, I will suggest that the chairman of these various investigating committees be invited to attend this session. No doubt they could make a better explanation of the expenditures of their committees than could the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. For instance, there is Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. He is chairman of the war expenditures investigation committee and of one of its subcommittees. There is my friend MCKENZIE, of Illinois, who is chairman of another special subcommittee. There is my friend FREAR, who is a great economist; he is chairman of another subcommittee; and there is my friend, the Hon. JOSEPHUS WALSH, of Massachusetts, who, by the way, is named after the distin-

guished Secretary of the Navy from the State of North Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. No. I deny that. [Laughter.] And I do not need an invitation to be present. I am usually here, and I am willing to give the gentleman any information I have.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is my friend, ROYAL JOHNSON, a distinguished soldier, from South Dakota. He is at the head of one of the committees that sailed around the world and went to Europe, and perhaps to Asia, Africa, and other places; and—

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I say to my friend—

Mr. KITCHIN. Not now. There is my friend, Mr. REAVIS, of Nebraska, who is one of the automobile investigators. If they were here they could explain. They knew these items were coming up this afternoon and knew that the gentleman from Texas was going to ask some questions about them and that he was very curious to know how all this money could possibly be spent; and he is going to be just about as curious as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was when the matter came up before him. He wanted to know—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I do not want to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield if the gentleman will not embarrass me. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply wanted to suggest on behalf of Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois that he and his committee have just returned from an investigation of Muscle Shoals and Nitro, and that they are so shocked with the wanton waste and extravagance exhibited there that they are too ill to attend the sessions of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I would prefer to have direct evidence rather hearsay as to that. As to the shock caused by their investigation of Muscle Shoals, the great extravagance of the expenditures of Mr. GRAHAM's committee have greatly shocked this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman will be perfectly satisfied with the kind of report that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] makes as to Muscle Shoals.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have no doubt I will.

Mr. MADDEN. And I hope that the gentleman will join Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois and others of us in bringing to light any extravagance he may find growing out of the expenditure of public money.

Mr. KITCHIN. So far as I know his reports have been perfectly satisfactory. He has found nothing as yet.

He has made several reports. He has been investigating for four or five or six months. He has been from this place to that place, and he has never yet been able to fix the responsibility for a single act of omission or commission upon a single human being. It has cost us some \$30,000 or \$40,000.

Mr. MADDEN. The administration is responsible for all the iniquities that have happened.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand, but your committees have spent \$70,000, and they have never been able to point their finger to a single individual connected with the administration who is responsible for any culpable act of omission or commission. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not the chairman of the committee, but if the gentleman wants any information I will be glad to give it to him.

Mr. JUUL. I was going to ask the gentleman if his idea was that they had covered their tracks so well that we could not find them.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know. I presume that about 19 out of 20 of them who had anything to do with this were Republicans. I believe some of the smoothest Republican employees in the country were running the matters of contracts and war expenditures for the administration, and if they did anything wrong they were able to cover their tracks. I do not say they did anything wrong, especially since the final reports of these committees are not in. I retain the privilege of thinking.

Mr. JUUL. If there are any Republicans who did anything wrong, I hope they will be caught and punished.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not by these Republican committees.

Mr. GOOD. I will try to answer the question that has been asked.

Mr. KITCHIN. I should like to have five minutes more. I am speaking in the time of the chairman. It is very kind of him. Of course, if I could get the time here I could go into that phase of the investigations more completely and definitely for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will make no request for time. We must get along with the bill. I am anxious to make a statement about the matter under consideration.



Mr. KITCHIN. If I can give you some information, I will be glad to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Inasmuch as the gentleman is attacking these investigating committees and subcommittees, and I presume they are pursuing their investigations under oath, I will ask the gentleman if he has been sworn, or is he making a statement here to discredit the committees of the House, or is he just making a speech?

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Uncle Joe, you always misunderstand me. [Laughter.] I am attacking no one, no committees. I am discrediting no one, no committees. I am not really objecting to anything, and I am not going to object to anything. I am going to vote for everything the chairman of this committee asks me to vote for, I think, and the steering committee, too, I reckon. [Laughter.] I just want some information. I know it can be explained. For instance, on page 1014 of the hearings on this bill is a statement of expenses of the subcommittee on aviation. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is chairman of that subcommittee. He is not here. He is an economist, and I know if he were here he could explain it thoroughly to my satisfaction.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does not the gentleman wait until Mr. FREAR is here?

Mr. KITCHIN. He is not here, and this item was not brought up until this afternoon. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] could explain it. On page 1014 is an item, "G. G. Gabrielson, 14 days and 5 hours, at \$25 a day, \$365.63; expenses, \$490.89." I can not understand, you know, why his expenses were about \$100 more than his salary, unless he was hired on the expense basis instead of on the salary basis, so that the expenses would be the principal thing and the salary the incident—why his salary should be \$25 a day and his expenses \$35 a day. I know that Mr. FREAR could explain that.

Here is another little item. My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] is present, and there is absolutely no doubt that he can explain this. On page 1015 I find "O. W. Illig, 25 days, at \$15 a day, \$375; expenses, \$187."

Another one: "W. J. Sperl, 25 days, at \$15 a day, \$375; expenses, \$185.61."

Here is another one for my friend FREAR's subcommittee: Salary, 18 days 3 hours, at \$25 a day, \$459.38; expenses, \$512.67."

Here is another one under my friend GRAHAM's subcommittee: "Services, 4 days, \$200; expenses, \$193." In some of these cases I would rather be employed on the expense basis than on a salary basis.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Perhaps the expenses were incurred in the moonshine district of the gentleman's State.

Mr. KITCHIN. In Ohio?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; in the gentleman's State.

Mr. KITCHIN. Not in my State.

Another thing, and I want to ask my friend the Hon. JOSEPHUS WALSH about that. I have heard some rumors, and the gentleman can correct them. I do not understand why, with four men on the committee, when my friend WALSH went out on the Pacific coast, maybe with one or two clerks and a janitor or a porter—I guess the railroad paid the porter and the janitor—I do not understand why his railroad expenses should be \$4,061, when the railroad expenses of my friend Mr. FREAR, who carried more parties to the Pacific coast and went into a larger examination, should have had railroad expenses of only \$1,401. I was wondering how the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] rode and how the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] rode. Evidently one of them rode on a freight train and the other one rode on a special observation car. [Laughter.] Why such a difference in Members of Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KITCHIN. I hope the Clerk will not read until we get some additional information.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. As I recall, when the resolution was up providing for the appointment of this select committee to investigate the War Department, the statement was made that the total expense would likely involve about \$250,000. My recollection is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asked why they did not ask for the full amount to be appropriated at that time, and expressed his willingness to vote for it. Now, I have forgotten just the amount of the total appropriations for the pur-

pose, but it does not approach the amount estimated at that time, as I remember.

The gentleman asked what this fund is to be used for. I will say that \$35,000 of the \$77,000 is estimated for the investigation of the Ordnance and Quartermaster Departments and camps—aviation, \$4,000; foreign expenditures, \$13,000. Those are the large items. The gentleman complains because these items are large. In going over the matter in the committee I attempted to develop, as much as I could, that we ought to be careful in the House and not spend money uselessly. I had in mind the waste, the extravagance, of the prior House in this regard. I did not want in this Congress that we should follow in the footsteps of the previous Congress and waste the people's money as you on the other side wasted it.

For instance, formerly under the expenditures by select committees you paid out \$37,000 for investigation of the antitrust act. You paid out \$49,906 for investigation of the Sugar and Steel Trusts. You paid out for investigation by a Committee on Banking and Currency of the so-called money trust, every penny of which was thrown away, \$61,217. You paid out in the investigation of the affairs of the District of Columbia \$51,191.03. You paid out for the investigation of the F. P. Lawson leak \$22,883.76. You paid out for the Ballinger-Pinchot investigation \$25,000.

Do you say that you did not pay any big fees? I think no one will make that claim in view of the evidence before the Committee on Appropriations. You paid an expert accountant, J. McRea, \$50 a day. You paid in the Lawson investigation to Mr. Sherman L. Whipple, counsel, \$15,000 and expenses of \$1,270.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman tell how much they paid Samuel Untermyer?

Mr. GOOD. I have forgotten; it is here somewhere; and I will get to it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It was a good, substantial amount.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; he got a substantial amount. You paid W. H. Spaulding, accountant, \$13,275. You paid H. P. Willis \$1,500 as an expert on rural credits. You paid Dr. Charles W. Richardson for professional services and expenses for four and a half days, at \$500 a day, \$2,487. You paid Samuel Untermyer for professional services, from April 12 to February, 1913, \$15,000.

Well, it seems to me that you set a pretty high mark. It seems to me that as far as we know now these expenditures, involving more than \$20,000,000,000 of Government contracts, have not approached anything like the extravagance of the previous investigations that never amounted to anything and which cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars. I hope that in its investigations the special committees of the House may keep in mind at all times the desire of Congress, so frequently expressed, that the executive departments shall maintain economy, shall be economical, and if we expect that of the various executive departments we ourselves must be economical. But I submit that in all the investigations the amount expended to date is not in excess of the amount that was anticipated that would be required to be expended at the time the resolution was passed and the amount which gentlemen on that side urged Congress to then appropriate for investigation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the question asked by the gentleman from North Carolina and for the purpose of the Record, because I know that he had the information before he asked the question, I desire to say that the Select Committee to Investigate the United States Shipping Board traveled to the Pacific coast and along the Pacific coast in a special car, perhaps something unheard of for a congressional committee, but it was found by myself on investigation, after outlining the itinerary of the trip and the time required to make it, that it would cost very little more to have the car where the committee could make its headquarters and on which they could and did hold some hearings, and proceed in that way.

Up to a couple of days before the committee departed on that trip it was expected that the minority members of the committee would be able to accompany the rest of the committee. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEELE] informed me that he would be precluded from going owing to the very serious illness of his mother, which illness, I understand, still continues. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had expected to go, but unexpectedly a matter of great importance came up within his district. He informed me that he had constituents, very important business men, here, which he felt he could not leave, and he owed them his assistance and influence in the situation that had arisen in his part of the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. No; not until I make this statement, which may not be perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman from North Carolina—



Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, it is perfectly satisfactory to me. The gentleman and his committee ought to ride in a special car, for I think he would have more intimidation and be able to get at the truth.

Mr. WALSH. I know the gentleman will recall that it is no new precedent. I think the Committee on Appropriations or a select committee made a trip to a certain section of the country for this purpose. I will say that the chairman endeavored to procure minority members to go with the committee, and conferred with the minority leader, ex-Speaker CLARK. He endeavored to fill the vacancy and consulted in my presence over the telephone with two or three Members, one of which was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE], but he was unable to go.

Now, I would state to the gentleman from North Carolina that while the expenses of the trip were somewhat more than that of the expenses of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], the committee on the investigation of the Shipping Board took its stenographer and its clerk and a statistician along with them. Also, at the request of the Shipping Board, it took one of the expert officials of the Shipping Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, I want to see if I can not get an agreement on the time for the discussion of this matter. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to—how much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin want?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know how much I want.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have five minutes. I think we ought to give some time to the gentleman from Wisconsin to give him a chance.

Mr. FREAR. Certainly we are entitled to be heard after the newspapers have given attention to the chairman of this committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. And if any other of these gentlemen, members of the committee, should come in, I think they ought to have a chance to explain also.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that in the exercise of proper procedure, we could get along. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto—

Mr. FREAR. Oh, the gentleman will not gain any time in that way.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been recognized.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that hearings were held at various points along the Pacific coast, and it is expected that the committee will visit other sections of the country in the near future. Whether we shall go in the same manner has not yet been determined.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to say for the benefit of every member of this committee that the people of the Pacific coast shall ever be grateful to the investigating committee headed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], which came there and exposed some conditions in connection with shipbuilding in that part of the country, which exposures have resulted in grand jury indictments and which will result in other indictments. All of that inquiry money was well spent, and it is due to those who faithfully performed their contracts with the Government that all others be exposed, tried, and convicted.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. WINGO. I want some information.

Mr. WALSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. WINGO. I want to know if the gentleman's committee took advantage of the authorization of the House to employ a maritime lawyer to assist them?

Mr. WALSH. We have not as yet.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman contemplate doing that?

Mr. WALSH. I do not think it will be necessary.

Mr. WINGO. I had hoped that the gentleman would do so. I am not criticizing him.

Mr. WALSH. I doubt if it will be necessary. I will say that the chairman found that to make a complete audit of the books of the United States Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation would cost between \$300,000 and \$400,000, and the committee decided not to undertake any such work.

While I do not desire to submit any partial report, I will state for the information of the Members of the House that the work of the committee is going along; that we found a situation in Seattle, resulting from the operations there, which I brought to the attention of the United States Attorney General and about which I and the committee felt it unwise to further interrogate witnesses, and that only recently one of the former officials of the Seattle office of the Shipping Board has been indicted by the grand jury there. I think the people may expect further indictments to follow. The United States attorney is to be congratulated upon the securing of this indictment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee investigating the Shipping Board is investigating the expenditure of a very considerable sum of money, the inception of which antedates the war by several weeks. The board was organized in January, I think, of 1917, although some of its activities began prior to that time. As far as I am personally concerned, and as far as the other members of the committee are concerned, so far as I know, this investigation is not proceeding along partisan lines, and if I have anything to do with it or any influence to wield, I shall do my best to see that it is not a partisan investigation, but is an attempt to find out how this vast sum of money has been expended, what has been done, and what has been accomplished. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] would not expect this or any other committee to embark on an investigation of this character without at least visiting some of the scenes of activity and having some hearings in the locality where the expenditures of money were being made and the activities were carried on.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunate in not being present to hear the suggestions made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], but I understand that he raised a question in respect to some of the expenditures that have been incurred by the investigating committee of which I am a member.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman no doubt has been misinformed. I expressly said that I knew the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] could explain and give the information which I desired.

Mr. FREAR. I am very glad to have the opportunity, but first let me say what I have to say in my own way, and then I will be very glad to answer any question.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish to say that my desire for information was exactly like that of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations before that committee. He said then that these figures of the investigating committees have been growing so large that he was anxious to know what the committees were doing, and so forth.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, I am very familiar with what the chairman has said, and I will ask the gentleman not to interrupt me, because I have read what he said in the New York Times. What he said has been bandied about to some extent, and it struck me as being a very unfair criticism for the chairman of any committee to make regarding men who are called upon to perform these investigating duties. We were drafted by the House unanimously to conduct this investigation to ascertain where \$1,000,000,000 has been expended for aircraft. We have endeavored to do this fairly, without any political bias, and we have endeavored in every way we could to ascertain the facts.

We have taken over 4,000 printed pages of testimony, most of which work has been conducted by ourselves. We were directed by the committee of fifteen to go to the Pacific coast, and we were requested both in person and by Judge Hughes's report to go to the coast and take testimony there regarding the spruce situation. For anyone at this time, a member of any committee, chairman or otherwise, to cast aspersions against the committee, as was represented by this newspaper, is not only uncalled for but it is grossly unfair. The proper course to pursue is to call the chairman or any member of a committee and find out what the expenditures are and ask explanations if desired. I did not want to serve on this committee, and I handed in my resignation to the Speaker after I had been appointed. I undertook the work finally as a matter of public duty, however, and I am ready to answer any questions either by the chairman of this committee or by the gentleman from North Carolina. If



you have any questions to ask regarding the committee's expenditures, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. KITCHIN. I just happened to notice the question which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations put in the hearings. I just casually observed it—

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has a good casual observation.

Mr. KITCHIN. I just happened to read it, and I said to myself that I would look over these items and see what alarmed the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and with reference to the gentleman's committee I do say, on the whole, maybe every bit of it, it looks to me as if the expenses were very small as compared with the work done. But I did notice this item—

Mr. FREAR. And I will say that the investigation has cost me \$100 over and above what I believed was a proper charge against the Government, but was paid for tips and other incidentals.

Mr. KITCHIN. It has been very economically done. But this item—

Mr. FREAR. I am not to blame for it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not kicking at extravagance, but some of the things I do not understand. Now, here is one of G. G. Gabrielson, 14 days and 5 hours, at \$25 per day, \$365; expenses, \$490. I did not know how the expenses could be greater than the salary.

Mr. FREAR. I am very glad to have the gentleman ask the question, and it is a simple one to answer. Gabrielson was an expert accountant hired by the committee at \$25 a day. He is now receiving \$35 a day from private parties. He was recommended by the firm by which he was employed, the Scudder firm, and by Judge Hughes as being a very reputable man from a very reputable firm. That includes the expenses and transportation from New York to Seattle and Portland and back to New York and board of three weeks, including his assistant, while engaged in going over the Spruce Corporation books so as to make a report in order that we might have an intelligent understanding of what those books contained.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And if he had had to pay Washington Hotel rates, he would not have gotten through on that amount.

Mr. FREAR. Gabrielson did not even go to an expensive hotel. I held him down under a previous agreement to \$5 a day and he complained, because he said it was not fair.

Mr. KITCHIN. He gets about \$35 a day for expenses.

Mr. FREAR. No; \$25 for services and whatever the expenses reached for himself and his assistant from New York to the coast and back.

Mr. KITCHIN. Fourteen days and \$490 expenses.

Mr. FREAR. He was engaged over three weeks from the time he left New York, three or four weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. At 14 days and expenses, \$490, it makes it about—

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. This is car fare, hotel bills, everything of that kind has been charged up. He paid those himself and we reimbursed him for his bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am asking the gentleman for the information of the House—

Mr. FREAR. There is another thing I would like to have the gentleman ask about—a \$2,500 item in the bill—if the gentleman will do so.

Mr. KITCHIN. I reckon that is all right; I had not seen that.

Mr. FREAR. I wanted to explain that, because it is one thing commented on in the newspapers and, I understand, by the chairman of the committee. The Sergeant at Arms turned over \$2,500 to my order in order that we could pay items as they were incurred out West without sending away back here to Washington. It was his proposal. I drew a check for every dollar of that to the secretary of the committee, and I insisted that he should make an itemized report for everything in the way of expenditures. That he did; and I never handled a dollar myself. The receipts are filed with the Clerk of the House. That covered hotel bills out West, railroad fare, and incidentals.

Mr. KITCHIN. I notice the Sergeant at Arms has twice as much confidence in the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Frear] as he had in the Hon. JOSEPHUS WALSH. [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to be interrupted to allow a lecture by the gentleman from North Carolina on the subject of my colleague from Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any further questions? I am ready to answer them.

Mr. KITCHIN. I notice the gentlemen's traveling expenses were smaller in proportion to the distance they traveled than any other committee. How many did the gentleman take with him to the coast?

Mr. FREAR. I think there were five Members all the time, and sometimes six or seven.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the Hon. JOSEPHUS WALSH, of Massachusetts—

Mr. FREAR. I want to answer any question the gentleman wants, but not to lecture my good friend from Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any further questions?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am just comparing. Now, it cost him, with only four Members, to take the same trip, \$4,061 railroad fare, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, with five Members, only \$1,402. I was wondering on what kind of a train the gentleman's committee rode. Did they ride on freight cars, cattle cars, or how did they get through with such a small amount?

Mr. FREAR. At times we were riding on hand cars and at times on speeders, and sometimes we were thrown off the track, and we had some very serious accidents. However, we took whatever conveyance was available.

Mr. KITCHIN. If my friend WALSH had taken the same precautions, they would have saved a few thousand dollars.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman said that the chairman of the committee had said something—

Mr. FREAR. Let me say the chairman of the Appropriation Committee was quoted by the New York Times, which has unjustly criticized our committee from start to finish, from the time we first called Homer Cummings before us to find out why he made the false statement that this was to be a junket trip, when, in fact, it was undertaken by the direction of and on the unanimous report of the committee of 15.

We were selected by the unanimous vote of this House. We did not want the job, but that paper has persistently misrepresented us up to the present time—insisted that we acted in a partisan way. And the chairman of the Appropriation Committee furnished the ammunition which is used and which is being constantly used against the committee. We are ready to explain every dollar expended and every action taken by the committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, I would like to hear from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. KITCHIN. I submit the regular order is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] should take the stand. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. CONNALLY. I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on this has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a pro forma amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want to make a point of order on anybody.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Just reserving the right to object, I would like to have about five minutes, unless the gentleman from Iowa will retract what he said about the former investigation. I would like to have five minutes to reply to him.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, do I get five minutes of that?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I happen to be a member of the select committee appointed to investigate the operations of the Shipping Board, about which the gentleman from Massachusetts made a statement a few moments ago. He was substantially correct in the statement to the effect that I had stated to him a few days before the committee left that I should be unable to go. That statement, as I say, is substantially correct. The gentleman from



Pennsylvania [Mr. STEELE] was also a member of the committee, but owing to sickness in his family he could not go. I had intended to go until a few days before the committee left. I had visited the Pacific coast before, and had no desire to make the trip for purposes of pleasure. At the same time I had been appointed a member of the committee and I intended to go, until some matters came up with the departments which were of great importance to my district and which demanded immediate and constant attention.

In addition, matters of legislation were then in prospect which increased my reluctance to going.

I have no first-hand information about the expenses, but I have confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I am sure that he, with the light then before him, did the best that he could.

There is one point, however, I desire to call to the attention of the committee, and that is the statement of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] that he already knew of great benefits that had resulted from the visit of the committee to the Pacific coast, in that it had resulted in indictments being found and prosecutions being brought about which would result in punishing some of those who had been guilty of misconduct in their dealings with the Government. I am glad, in that connection, to hear the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts that this investigation is not to be partisan but that it is to be nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and a real investigation, and I join in the hope that such may be the conduct of the committee as to justly merit that characterization; and, so far as my efforts on the committee are concerned, I shall undertake to make them absolutely nonpartisan and impartial. It shall not make any difference to me who the party may be. If he is guilty, he should be punished. However, I think I detect an early divergence from that announced policy on the part of the gentleman from Washington in the statement he made a little while ago.

I happen to know, without going to the Pacific coast, without having made the trip with the committee, that long before the committee was created the Department of Justice had begun investigation of the very matter which the gentleman from Washington says has so developed as to result in indictments by the grand jury. I happen to know, without going to the Pacific coast, that the Shipping Board, through its own bureau of intelligence, before the committee was even appointed, had already laid these matters before the district attorney of that district, and that the Attorney General had, through his secret agents, already been investigating these very matters. And I deem it a rather extravagant claim on the part of the gentleman from Washington—

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me finish the sentence.

I deem it a rather extravagant claim on the part of the gentleman from Washington to affirm that the visit of this committee to the Pacific coast had resulted in these indictments, because it should be known that the Department of Justice, in pursuance of investigations which it had instituted long before, has secured the indictment of this Capt. Blaine, to which reference was made by the gentleman from Washington.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that what he has said is true, with this exception, that the Attorney General had completed his investigation, that the secret service of the Shipping Board had stopped its operations on these lines, and it was only when additional information was furnished that they sent their agents, and recalled some agents who had been in the field to undertake operations there.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will state in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I thank him for his partial confirmation of what I have said, but I happen to have had opportunity to confer with the Shipping Board and with the individual officials who conducted these investigations, and I happen to know that concurrently with the efforts of the gentlemen on the Pacific coast these investigations were still being carried on, and that it was my advice that a great deal of the information which the committee is in some quarters credited with having laid before the Department of Justice was, in fact, received by the committee before its departure from the secret-service agents of the Shipping Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in agreeing to the 10 minutes, I thought the gentleman understood the gentleman was to have 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent the time of the gentleman be extended 2 minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I misunderstood then.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I thought the understanding was that I was to have five minutes, but I will take what I can get and am very thankful for it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I agree to the request, then, because I had promised the gentleman from North Carolina five minutes, and I would like to comply with my promise.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield the gentleman four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is as generous as I could expect from the chairman of this committee. [Laughter.] The gentleman was explaining the extravagance of these so-called investigating committees. I did not say they were extravagant, but the gentleman from Iowa was the first to intimate that they were extravagant, and I have simply asked for an explanation.

He said the Democrats had expended an extravagant sum of money on the Money Trust investigation, which he says amounted to nothing, and had paid so much money to a lawyer, and so much money to this man, and to that man, and the other man.

Why, gentlemen, that Money Trust investigation was worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the American people. That Money Trust investigation resulted in the change of our financial system. It resulted in the passage of the Federal reserve act and the rural credits act. It divulged the fact that one firm in the United States controlled a whole banking system in the United States. It could make or prevent panics at its will. Commerce and business of the entire country were subject to its will. It controlled, through its banks and interlocking directorates, more than two-thirds of the voting stock of the railroads of this country. [Applause.]

That investigation caused the American people and the Congress to take the control of the banking system, the control of expansion and contraction of money and credit out of the hands of that firm and the Wall Street banks and put it in the control of the Government. It was said that Mr. Whipple, employed as attorney with the so-called leak investigating committee, got \$15,000. Who caused that leak investigation? The Republicans in that Congress. Who fixed the amount of that fee? The Democrats asked the Republicans on the committee to fix it at what was right, and the Republicans, with Mr. LENROTH at their head, fixed it at \$15,000. All agreed that that was fair and just. I think Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas was on that committee, and he agreed that it was right. That committee had only one attorney.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What do they pay?

Mr. KITCHIN. They have got an attorney not only for the general committee but for all except a few of the subcommittees. They have one man as attorney, Gen. Ansell, employed by Mr. Graham's committee, at the rate of \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year. They have another subcommittee of this war investigating committee which has a lawyer at about \$1,200 or \$1,500 a month. Each of these lawyers has a clerk and a secretary whom we are paying. Democrats never did this.

Mr. FREAR. Does the gentleman say my committee was employing Mr. Ansell as an attorney who receives \$20,000?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; yours has not, and Mr. WALSH's has not. When we investigated a real matter that interested the whole country we made better bargains than these committees have made. You will find that in these investigating committees under Democratic Congresses we employed the Scudders, and we paid them \$25 a day. But these committees pay them \$50 a day.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am sorry I have not the time to yield.

Mr. FREAR. Judge Hughes requested us to employ that firm.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Democrats used them. They did such good work for the Democrats in their investigations that the Republicans took them and paid them 100 per cent more than we paid.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says we expended a vast sum of money in these investigations. He said no Republican questioned the expenditures at the time. No man could question them, because we had nonpartisan investigations, both Republicans and Democrats being on those investigating committees, and the Republicans indorsed every one of the items and came in here and said they were right. Not a Democrat and not a Republican questioned it. Not a man in the country questioned it, because every one knew they were economical expenditures, and they knew that the investigations were necessary. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. The Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

For stationery for officers and committees of the House on account of the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, \$6,387.95.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 37, after line 21, insert the following:

"For an assistant clerk to the Committee on Appropriations at the rate of \$3,000 per annum from February 16 to June 30, 1920, inclusive, \$1,125."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has one clerk and three assistants. One of these assistants has resigned, a very able clerk. The clerk of the committee is a very able clerk.

I want to say to the House that this committee, reporting bills carrying many hundreds of millions of dollars—I might say billions—for the consideration of the House, requires much of investigation. In addition to that there is a deficiency bill. This is the second one we are considering now at this session, and we shall have to consider a third one. They require an examination of all the bills of all the committees that report appropriation bills.

I became a member of the Committee on Appropriations in 1878. There was a boy brought up from Tennessee by the name of James C. Courts. John D. C. Atkins was the chairman of the committee. At that time the committee had all the bills making appropriations for the Government service. It never had but one clerk previously. His health failed. At the end of the first Congress in which I served on this committee this young man from Tennessee became the clerk of that committee, and in all the decades that passed from that time up to the time of his death there was no man who ever occupied such a position, so far as I know and can ascertain, who was so well equipped from the standpoint of all legislation requiring experience as James C. Courts.

One night—or rather one morning—just before the adjournment of a short session, with the sundry civil bill undisposed of, a gentleman now dead, Mr. DeArmond, from Missouri, when I offered a conference report on the sundry civil bill, and the Congress was to expire on the 4th day of March, asked for an hour. I said, "I hope not; I can not assent." "Ah," said Mr. DeArmond, "the gentleman has no quorum here. I demand it." Very well. He took his hour, and he ran amuck. Except the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], I think there never was a man so able with his tongue as DeArmond was. It was like a knife and a dagger. He wound up by making a little attack in two sentences upon myself as chairman of that great committee to the effect that "the clerk had made the reputation of every chairman of that committee, including the then present chairman." I had to extend more time to him, but finally he sat down, and I said, "Yes; that is true about the clerk and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I wish to God that somebody would get a competent clerk for the gentleman from Missouri." That closed the debate, and in two minutes the conference report was agreed to, and at 12 o'clock noon—by this time it had gotten to be 6 in the morning—the last bill was passed. Mr. Courts has crossed over, but I want to say that I am satisfied that James C. Courts shortened his life by a decade or longer by his great, strenuous, and valuable work.

I want to make another statement. When I was Speaker of this House for eight years there stood at my right hand another man, Mr. Asher Hinds, author of the eight great volumes of Hinds' Precedents. I believe he shortened his life, by a decade or more, by the compilation of those Precedents and the assistance that he gave to the Speaker, who frequently needed help during those eight years.

Now, as a successor to Mr. Courts as clerk of the Committee on Appropriations we have the present clerk, Mr. Marcellus C. Sheild. I think he is quite the equal of James C. Courts. Time and again I have noticed that Members on both sides of the House, when they want something quick, go in to see Mr. Sheild, as they used to go in to see Mr. Courts, because the information is furnished them promptly. I think Mr. Sheild is fully Mr. Courts's equal in his familiarity with appropriations, in his courtesy, and in his usefulness to the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HICKS. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say that the clerk and assistant clerks of the committee, which sometimes has three or more subcommittees sitting, work most nights and most Sundays. The health of the present clerk is threatened. The first assistant has resigned. He hopes he can do better in his profession.

I offer this amendment now, because I believe it will bring a man as an assistant clerk at \$3,000 a year who will be fairly well equipped touching the public service. I believe this assistant is needed. The expense is negligible when compared with the magnitude of the appropriations which are handled. I offer this amendment, and I trust the gentleman will not make the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I reserved the point of order, and the item is certainly subject to it; but is it the judgment of the chairman of this committee that this additional clerk is necessary in order to carry on efficiently the work of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. GOOD. I felt a good deal as the former chairman of the committee did. I had hoped that the work of the committee would let up. This matter was presented to Mr. Sherley a year ago by some of the clerks of the committee. They thought they were working beyond their strength. Mr. Sherley felt that perhaps after the signing of the armistice the work would decrease. Instead of that the work has increased. The clerks have never complained, but just as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has explained to the House, these clerks work overtime. They work all day and they work into the night. They are compelled to work practically every Sunday. They feel they ought to have some additional help, and while I have hesitated to ask for an additional clerk, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has stated the facts.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We are all for this.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. I hope there will be no objection to the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the statements made by the chairman of the committee and by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has well said, there has never been any question of politics or partisanship in the selection of the clerks to the Committee on Appropriations. As has been stated, for many years, beginning under a Democratic chairman and continuing under Republican chairmen, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] being one of them, a gentleman from Tennessee—Mr. James C. Courts—served as clerk to the Committee on Appropriations. At his death Mr. Fitzgerald, who was then chairman of the committee, appointed the present clerk, Mr. Sheild, and I very earnestly indorse all the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said concerning him. He is as well qualified as was Mr. Courts for the difficult and responsible duties of his position, and that is paying him a very high compliment, for Mr. Courts was recognized by everybody as an authority on appropriations. When Mr. Sherley came in as chairman of the committee, succeeding Mr. Fitzgerald, he retained the personnel of the committee force. When Mr. Sherley retired and Mr. Good became chairman, without inquiry as to the politics of the various clerks to the committee, he retained the force as he found it. The Committee on Appropriations, as every member of the committee knows, has a most competent force. There is not, in my judgment, a man in the city of Washington who has more general information as to the appropriations of this Government than the present clerk of the committee, Mr. Sheild.

Nor is there a man who is more useful to the Congress than Mr. Sheild in his present position. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said, he works not only in the daytime but he works at night in the performance of these duties, and is wearing himself out at it. The committee is divided into some five or six subcommittees. Two of these subcommittees, as a rule, are running all the time. It is necessary to have clerks attending upon these subcommittees. The hearings of the committee have increased in volume 200 or 300 per cent over what they were before the war came on. As you know, the appropriations have increased enormously. All of this has resulted in greatly increased work. Notwithstanding that fact, there has been no increase in the force of the Committee on Appropriations since the year 1913. In justice to these gentlemen who are so faithfully performing this service and in justice to the Congress itself, which must depend largely upon these clerks in the matter of information and the many details connected with these appropriations, I hope this amendment will be adopted without question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.



The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Holidays: To enable the Public Printer to comply with the provisions of the law granting holidays and the Executive order granting half holidays with pay to the employees of the Government Printing Office, \$70,108.81.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Is this amount appropriated here rendered necessary by any recent legislation?

Mr. GOOD. This is to provide the pay for the present force. Under the law the Public Printer is authorized to pay the employees for holidays just as though they were at work on a regular work day.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is this legislation that has been enacted since the general appropriation bill was passed?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How does it come to be a deficiency? In other words, why was it not provided for?

Mr. GOOD. The exact amount of the estimate was appropriated for this item. The force has increased somewhat, and my recollection is that there have been some holidays and half holidays given since then.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. GOOD. The amount necessary to take care of January 1, February 22, May 30, and two half holidays in June totals \$92,000. The estimate provides also for one contingent holiday of \$23,000.

That is the statement of Mr. Ford before the committee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is meant by a "contingent holiday"?

Mr. GOOD. We asked that question and Mr. Ford said:

We do not know and we do not include it in our regular estimate, but always provide for it in the deficiency estimate. This year we have already had one contingent holiday—Pershing day. If an Executive order is issued declaring a holiday we have to close down, and that is the reason we put in the deficiency estimate for one contingent holiday. If there should be none the amount would revert to the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2690. An act authorizing the appointment of a minister to Finland;

S. 620. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the Pioneer Educational Society and its successor for certain lands in the diminished Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington;

S. 730. An act to amend chapter 559 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved March 3, 1891;

S. 2962. An act for the relief of Nick Sitch and Billie H. Evashanks;

S. 604. An act for the relief of Delilah Siebenaler;

S. 3138. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands for stockyards, and for other purposes, at Browning Station, in the State of Montana;

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians;

S. 3610. An act for the relief of William S. Britton, formerly second lieutenant of Infantry, who has been erroneously dropped from the rolls of the United States Army;

S. 2956. An act to amend sections 4874 and 4875 of the Revised Statutes and to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries;

S. 3406. An act for the purchase of buildings and grounds for the embassy of the United States at Brussels, Belgium;

S. 907. An act for the relief of John B. H. Waring;

S. 20. An act to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana;

S. 3750. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for the loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, as amended by the act of July 9, 1918, and for other purposes;

S. 2442. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church by patent in fee certain land within the Yankton Indian Reservation;

S. 2786. An act authorizing the sale of lands in Gregory County, S. Dak.;

S. 3682. An act to regulate the filling of vacancies in the corps of cadets in the United States Military Academy not otherwise provided for by existing law, and for other purposes; and

S. 3683. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes";

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1812. An act making an appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States;

H. R. 2950. An act to authorize a preference right of entry by certain Carey Act entrymen, and for other purposes;

H. R. 348. An act to add certain lands to the Ochoco National Forest, Oreg.;

H. R. 8028. An act to add to the Oregon, Siuslaw, and Crater National Forests in Oregon certain lands that were revested in the United States pursuant to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Oregon & California Railroad Co. against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8598. An act restoring to Amy E. Hall her homestead rights and providing that on any homestead entry made by her she shall be given credit for all compliance with the law on her original homestead entry and for all payments made on same; and

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of the Farmers' National Bank of Wilkinson, Ind.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 400. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

The printing and binding for the Post Office Department, exclusive of the money-order office, \$150,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General is authorized hereafter to have executed in the field offices of the Postal Service or in private establishments such printing for the Postal Service as in his judgment can be more economically done there than at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the proviso.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the situation with regard to the printing in the Post Office Department is this: Under the law now the postmaster at Seattle, Wash., where they may have a paper mill and a big printing establishment, where he could have the work done cheaply, is obliged to have it done by the Public Printer in Washington, who has to buy the paper, ship it here, and ship the printing back there. They can not have any public printing done in that locality. The result has been that the Post Office authorities came before us and said that a large part of their estimate is because of the present requirement of the law that compels them to have the public printing done in the Government Printing Office. Take the Postal Guide, for instance. The Post Office Department asked for bids on that. A printer in Albany, N. Y., bid for the complete guide in cloth \$22,900. The Public Printer charged \$40,000. If the gentleman will take the hearings, page 420, he will find that in all or nearly all of the statements there it costs about 25 per cent more to get the work done in the Government Printing Office than it would cost by private contract. This provision merely provides that the Post Office Department may submit for competitive bids and let it to the lowest bidder. That is in effect what the provision is. That ought to be the law. If that were the law, it would not only bring efficiency to the Government Printing Office, where there is now not the semblance of efficiency, but it would permit the Government to have the work done where it could get it done the cheapest. I submit that the Government ought to be permitted to do that thing. I realize that it is a change in existing law.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HICKS. Were there submitted to the Committee on Appropriations about how much it would save the Government if this proviso was inserted in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. In this specific item that we have carried here, the \$150,000, the Post Office Department makes the claim that, if we do not carry this legislation we must increase it by \$50,000. We decreased the amount by \$50,000 because the Post Office Department said that if they were permitted to do this they could decrease the expenditure by that amount. The gentleman from New York asked about other departments—not all of the other departments were before us for deficiencies.



The matter came up after we heard some of them and did not know that there was any such claim made, but the general impression is from the officials who expend money for public printing that if they had this right they would save a great deal of money. The Post Office Department and the Treasury Department both claim that if they could have their printing and binding done by contract, let it to the lowest bidder, they would save a great deal of their appropriation. How much they would save in the whole service I do not know, but I believe it would run into a great many thousand dollars, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not make the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings and listened to the claims made by the gentleman from Iowa. I doubt if we should single out the Postmaster General for this purpose. The gentleman referred to the Postal Guide. I think that is published under a specific provision of law in the legislative bill.

Mr. GOOD. They all have to go to the Government Printing Office under the law.

Mr. WALSH. I think not. I think the legislative bill or the sundry civil bill gives them authority to have the Postal Guide printed outside of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GOOD. That has been superseded by an act which compels the printing of the Postal Guide and all other Government publications to be done in the Government Printing Office. I am sure that if the gentleman will go into any department of the Government to-day and talk with the officers that have to do with letting of printing he will be convinced that there must be some change in this respect.

Mr. WALSH. I am convinced of that; we ought to have less printing done; but this allows them to go out into the open market wherever they think they can get their printing more economically done.

Mr. GOOD. It will still have to be done by contract.

Mr. WALSH. This does not say that it will be done by contract. He just ascertains that it will be more economical to do this in private establishments than in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentleman will allow us to make this experiment.

Mr. WALSH. I do not care to permit the Post Office Department to embark upon any such experiment. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding for the Treasury Department, \$25,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice on this page that there are many large amounts appropriated for the various departments under the head of deficiencies. These departments heretofore under the appropriate bills have already received appropriations deemed to be sufficient. Is it impossible for a department to live within its appropriation? Here is \$1,000,000 for public printing and public binding, and paper, in addition to what this bureau has already received under the sundry civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1920. Below that are various appropriations for other departments. I am interested to ascertain why it is that the functionaries of these departments can not submit to the committee on appropriations when the regular bills are under consideration reasonable estimates of what the expenditures are likely to be, so that it will not be necessary in all of these cases to follow up the regular appropriation with a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, in this particular instance, as I recall the explanation, it was that the Public Health Service was having a great deal more printing done, and also the claim is made that there has been great increase of cost in the printing.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Increased cost since the sundry civil appropriation act was passed?

Mr. GOOD. They asked for \$100,000, and we have given them only \$25,000.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I wonder that they did not ask for \$200,000. Have these increases, these decided increases, in the cost of printing occurred since the last sundry civil appropriation act was passed?

Mr. GOOD. They claim there has been quite a considerable increase, especially in the cost of printing, since the last sundry civil appropriation act.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And has there not been an increase in wages, too?

Mr. GOOD. I am not sure whether that has occurred since the passage of the last sundry civil appropriation act or not.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. By reason of the act of Congress, the testimony of the Public Printer was that there has been an increase in the cost of labor.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I would ask the chairman of the committee in regard to this item of \$1,000,000 for printing, whether there are in that any holdovers from the Bulletin of Information that was published at No. 10 Jackson Place?

Mr. GOOD. No; there is nothing of that kind in this item.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the judgments contained herein shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I do not know that I quite understand how these items specified at the bottom of the page as judgments of the Court of Claims can be deficiencies, when none of them becomes available until after the right of appeal has expired. How can they be considered deficiencies?

Mr. GOOD. Without looking at any of these particular judgments, I think none of them is certified to the committee until after the right of appeal has expired. The rights of appeal are expiring every day.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seems to me on the face of things that they can not be deficiencies until the right of appeal has expired. This provision applies to all of these judgments, and one can not tell from reading the bill whether the right of appeal has expired. If it has expired, then there is no use of putting the provision in.

Mr. GOOD. The committee had before it the date when they would be payable, if not appealed. For example, I know there was one judgment of about a thousand and ninety-six dollars on which the right of appeal will expire on the 8th of February. The department assures itself that the right of appeal will not be exercised before they certify the judgment. These are judgments that the department knows will not be appealed, because the attorneys have assured them that they would accept the award.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has this provision been carried in deficiency appropriation bills heretofore?

Mr. GOOD. It has been carried right along.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Do any of these judgments carry the payment of interest?

Mr. GOOD. All judgments of the United States courts carry an interest payment of 4 per cent, as I recollect, after the date of its judgment.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. All claims against the United States are recovered by judgment obtained in a court of the United States?

Mr. GOOD. I am not sure about the Court of Claims.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. All judgments obtained against the United States in a court of the United States other than the Court of Claims carry an interest rate of 4 per cent?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. From the date of the recovery of the judgment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; so that it is important that the Government pay the judgment and not let it drag.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting the revenue from customs, \$1.10.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what sort of claims are these? Some of these seem to be very trifling in amount. How are these claims established? I see here, for instance, a claim for \$1.10.

Mr. GOOD. Most of them are claims where they are certified by the auditor and the appropriation has expired and it has been covered back into the Treasury under the covering-in act.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. For instance, what sort of a claim would it be for collecting the revenues from customs, \$1.10?

Mr. GOOD. That likely is a refund to some one where the collection was made more than three years before there was a demand for its return.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Where the Government collected from the individual, in excess of what it should have collected, \$1.10?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. When an application for its return is made within three years from the time the collection is made, then the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to return it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, \$25,665.15.



Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will not pass by the item under lines 23 and 24. I will give the chairman my reason for making that request: There is now on the way from the Treasury Department a letter from Commissioner Roper addressed to the chairman of the committee relating to a claim that should have been long ago paid, a judgment against certain officers of the United States. There is no question about this liability. The claim was inadvertently omitted from the document which covered cases of this character. The letter will be here, I imagine, within five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. These are audited claims we are reading.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Well, this is an audited claim of which I speak. It was negligence on the part of the Treasury Department that it was not presented to the chairman of the committee when he was making up this bill.

Mr. GOOD. Which item is that?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The one relating to payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the item referred to in lines 23 and 24, page 40, be passed over temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that lines 23 and 24, on page 40, be passed over temporarily to be returned to later. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowance or drawback, \$1,787.12.

Mr. WALSH. The language of line 25 in the copy I have reads, "For allowance or drawback." It was read by the Clerk "allowance of drawback." I would like to ascertain what the language was.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the language referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowance or drawback, \$1,787.12.

For surveying the public lands, \$9.49.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an item for surveying the public lands, \$9.49. I would like to ask the chairman if these are lands we are going to give our returned soldiers—

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. BLANTON. For their service in France?

Mr. GOOD. No; these are some lands in Texas which we would not inflict on the soldiers.

Mr. BLANTON. If they are lands in Texas, it would take more than that to survey a half an acre, because of their value.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1918, \$8,557.12.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice a deficiency item here for the support of Indian schools of 1 cent. I want to know if that is about the amount of money that has been given for the support of the Washington schools here in the District of Columbia? I understand from one of the teachers of the Central High School that on yesterday there were 15 large classes of students, young men and young women, boys and girls, going to that school—15 large classes organized without a single teacher to teach them, because of the fact that there was not money to employ them. Now, that is an awful condition to exist here in the District of Columbia. We have been starving our teachers too long. There was a provision in this bill to meet the emergency, but the most of it was stricken out. Has the chairman explained the situation to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], who, on a point of order, caused that appropriation to be stricken out, because I believe if the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who is a man of the best judgment in this House, had understood the exact situation with respect to the schools in the District of Columbia at this time, that rather than have stricken out the item he would have been in favor of doubling every dollar of it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have no objection to its being returned to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the chairman of the committee by appropriate amendment ask that that item be put back in the bill, because as a matter of fact in the various high schools of this District to-day, in every single school building, there are several large classes of boys and girls who are wholly without teachers because of the want of funds, and I am sure it is of sufficient importance for the chairman to put those items back in the bill?

Mr. GOOD. There is an understanding we will return to that item.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am very glad of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For International Radiotelegraphic Convention, 1918-19, \$275.24.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question if the gentleman from Virginia will permit. What was this radiotelegraphic convention? What had our Government to do with it?

Mr. GOOD. What is the item?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The item is for International Radiotelegraphic Convention, 1918-19, \$275.24.

Mr. GOOD. So far as these audited claims are concerned, it has not been the practice of the committee to conduct hearings further than to find that they had been audited in accordance with the law, and I can not give the gentleman any further information than he finds here. There has been appropriation made in the past for this convention, but I presume it is a claim that grew out of the convention, and has been audited in accordance with the law. We only inquire into the question as to whether or not the claims fall within the class and have been properly audited and found to be all right.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then this claim was audited and allowed?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I wanted to ask the chairman if this item is authorized by law.

Mr. GOOD. It is.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it a deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they are deficiencies, because there is no appropriation out of which to pay them.

Mr. BLANTON. How is there a deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. It has been audited since the sundry civil bill passed.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it an item of new legislation?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. BLANTON. When was this radiotelegraphic convention authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. I will give the gentleman the law in regard to audited claims. Just when this claim originated I can not say.

Mr. BLANTON. When was the payment of \$275.24 for an international radiotelegraphic convention, to be held in 1918-19, authorized by law?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman is mistaken. This is not a convention held. Here is the situation—

Mr. BLANTON. That is what it stated in the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. All these claims are certified by the auditor as correct, and payable, and authorized by law. That is all we have to concern ourselves with.

Mr. BLANTON. In the short time I have been in Congress I know of no such authorization by Congress to hold this kind of convention. When was it authorized?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. My recollection is that there was an authorization and an appropriation, but I am not able to tell the gentleman when and where. But it could not be audited unless the auditor found there was an authorization of law for it, and, ordinarily, unless there had been an appropriation for it. Whether the auditor made an incorrect finding, I have no way of knowing; but that is the finding.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if this is just a way around exceeding the appropriations? Now, I happen to be on the committee that went through a very strenuous struggle on some of these items, and we cut some of them down materially, and I beg to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to his statement that these are all authorized by law before the auditor could audit them. I do not believe there is any law to provide for contingent expenses to foreign missions.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BEGG. And for half of these other things, if the gentleman will permit me, there is not any basic law, and it is simply a custom that has been allowed to grow up in these departments whereby they can spend any amount of money they want to, after the committee has gone carefully into the situation and then has seen fit to give them less than they asked for. They get around the bush in some other way and get it audited and present the claim as an audited claim, without any facts to warrant it.

And I want again, if I may, to call the attention of the committee to the antideficiency law, which provides specific methods whereby they can exceed their appropriation. And it does



seem to me—and I am in sympathy with the chairman of the committee in all that he is asking for, and am willing to go with him all the way—we are forgiving each time the violation of the law, not only in spirit but in actual expenditure, by permitting them to come up and ask for money before they actually commit the violation of the law, and we give it to them. I can not see any excuse for one-half of the items on pages 45 and 46, so far as they are being deficiencies are concerned. And I can see no excuse for their happening in the future. I will be glad if the gentleman from Illinois will tell me where the law is that authorizes contingent expenses and post allowances.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there are two kinds of claims which may properly be audited where Congress has made an appropriation for a specific purpose. Claims arising under that are properly audited, although it frequently happens that the money is not available, because it may have been covered into the Treasury before the amount is payable. In another class of cases is authority of law to do a particular thing, whether an appropriation is specifically made or not. But the auditor can not audit any of these claims unless he finds there is authority of law for incurring the claim.

Now, I have not examined into all the audited claims in this bill, but I have examined a great many in the course of my experience in this House, sometimes suspecting, like the gentleman who just addressed the House, that a claim had been audited without authority of law in order to beat the devil around the stump; and I never was able to find one, and if the distinguished gentleman is able to find one he will put quite a feather in his hat. And I suggest to him that he can not do a better thing than take up the lot of claims he refers to here and go and examine the audit and find out whether there was actually authority of law or not, because, if there was not, the auditor ought to be removed from office and would be subject to impeachment. He can not audit a claim simply because he thinks it ought to be paid. He has to audit a claim because there is an authorization of law to incur the claim. There can be no such authorization of law unless there is some specific law giving the authority or an appropriation authorizing its expenditure.

Mr. BEGG. The point I wanted to call to the gentleman's attention is this: I will agree that the claim is a bona fide claim and the auditor is excused—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The bona fides of the claim has nothing to do with it. That is what the auditor is for—not to examine the bona fides of the claim, but to ascertain whether it is authorized by law.

Mr. BEGG. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that in these post allowances and these contingent expenses there is no basic law on the statute books of the United States further than the temporary provision which made available the sum of money for doing that specific work, and whoever contracts to do work beyond that appropriation is technically, if not actually, a law violator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. May I proceed for two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the circumstances named by the gentleman the claim would not be audited.

Mr. BEGG. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that thing is being done every day. It is being done not only in one department but in all the departments, and they do not undertake to deny it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will undertake, if the gentleman will give me a specific case, to investigate it myself.

Mr. BEGG. I will ask the gentleman to go and investigate and see if they have not exceeded their appropriation in these very bills that they bring up here and ask for a deficiency on, every one of them. There is not any way of getting around it. The testimony of the State Department before the Committee on Foreign Affairs was to the effect that they wanted this lump sum contingent, and this credit that was to be apportioned to the Secretary of State by the President of the United States according to his wishes and whims, to take care, as they said, of the differences in living conditions, and the very fact that they are brought in as audited claims must be proof either that they are not in existence or else they have been actually expended. Now, if they are not in existence they ought not to be here. I do not criticize the chairman of this committee or say that he is wrong in bringing in a deficiency that does not exist; but when the Committee on Foreign Affairs has cut them down and has said, "You must live within the appropriations," are they to be allowed to go along and spend the money

regardless of the limit set and come back here for a deficiency? We have cut off, for example, \$300,000 from one item and two or three hundred thousand on another item.

It seems to me that this Congress ought to get down and make good its statements to the public to the effect that it is trying to economize. I want to say to you that I do not believe in carrying on these expenses as they have been going on in the war, and I am not in sympathy with the payment of these bills if they are illegally contracted, and I am in favor of making the man that contracted for them come along and pay it out of his own salary.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman complains about the items on page 46 for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers, \$248.89?

Mr. BEGG. Yes. That is only one of many.

Mr. GOOD. That was an appropriation for 1917. By its very terms the balances were covered into the Treasury on June 30, 1919, and then this claim comes before the auditor after that date, and there is no way except to follow the provisions of the law and to audit the claim and send it to Congress. That is what has been done, so far as this claim is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] a question. Are we sliding back into the bad old system of allowing these heads of departments to exceed the appropriations or not?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, they have been exceeding the appropriations. That is the reason for deficiencies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When was that law repealed by which we made it a criminal offense for one of them to exceed the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. It has not been repealed. It is on the statute books still, but nobody has gone to jail. They have been violating the law just the same.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do they not enforce the law?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know. I am not in charge of any executive department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman has been here a long time, and he and others are always talking about the extravagance of Congress. The truth is it is the extravagance of the executive departments. We warned them time after time to stop it, and they did not heed the warning, and finally we made it a criminal offense for them to exceed the appropriations; and yet they are going on just as before.

Mr. GOOD. We also provided that the person violating the law should be discharged, but nobody has been discharged and nobody has been sent to jail. Then the question is, Shall Congress refuse to make an appropriation to cover the balances so that the service may continue even though the appropriation falls into the hands of the person who has violated the law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If they practice that kind of a caper, what was the sense of putting that statute on the statute books, forbidding them to do it and making it a criminal offense?

Mr. GOOD. That statute was put on the books so that the head of a department can lodge a complaint against the man who violates the law. Congress can not discharge a man. The head of an executive department can, when the man violates the law, and he can lodge a complaint against the man with the Attorney General.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman and others state that the department violates a statute which prohibits any of them from incurring a deficiency. Why does not somebody state which one? In my short experience I do not know one who has been named as having actually violated the statute. If they have, why not say so? Why not let us say in the RECORD who did it? The hearings up to this time at which I have been present fail to show who did it. Time and time again chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, for the purpose of holding them down, have delivered lectures on the subject, and very good ones, too, but I do not now recall a single instance where an executive officer has done that.

Mr. GOOD. There are quite a number of instances that were called to the attention of the executive departments in these hearings. The printed hearings will show that.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not think the gentleman will find it in the hearings. I should like to be shown.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.



Mr. CANNON. During the war at least two chairmen of the Appropriations Committee were confronted by emergencies where appropriations of money were absolutely necessary. They said, "Well, now, we can not pass this at once. We will say to you that you will be cared for by a report of the committee on the proper bill, for the action of the House, and we have no doubt that the appropriation will be made." I never said it myself, because I was not the chairman of the committee, but I agreed to it in my heart, and we agreed to care for them in that way for that purpose. There is a maxim, "Inter arma leges silens"—In time of war the laws are silent. Well, that is not universally true by any manner of means, yet in point of fact I have no doubt that in many instances during the war the laws were silent, and had to be under the conditions that existed.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. When an annual appropriation is made, and that appropriation has been exhausted, it is illegal for any auditor to certify a claim to Congress. If, on the other hand, the appropriation was not exhausted, \$1,000 for instance remaining, and that \$1,000 was covered into the surplus fund or to miscellaneous receipts at the end of the second year after the one for which the appropriation was made, then an auditor might state an account within the limit of that \$1,000 as a legal claim against the Government, but he could not go beyond the \$1,000. Moreover, if a statutory salary is fixed at \$2,000, and Congress fails to make the appropriation for the payment of that salary, an auditor may state an account to the Congress for an appropriation to pay that as a legal claim. So far as the annual appropriations are concerned an auditor has no authority under the law to state an account under any circumstances. But again, take these refunds of customs and internal-revenue taxes. In normal times prior to the war we were paying refunds of customs and internal-revenue taxes running from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year, where taxes were collected in excess of the legal amounts. There are permanent indefinite appropriations for the payment of those refunds, and a case of that character should not appear here. It should be paid out of the permanent indefinite appropriation provided for in the permanent statute.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. In a moment. If, however, one of those refund cases has gone to court, and the court has allowed costs and interest in addition to the amount of the tax collected in excess, you will have the claim plus cost plus interest, with no appropriation for costs or interest. That claim when audited should be sent here for an appropriation.

Now, in the main any auditor who certifies claims under any other conditions will be laying himself liable to the penalties of the law that have just been specified. Many times the executive departments will come and ask auditors to state claims in excess of the appropriations. That is not an uncommon thing. It is an easy way to evade responsibility. Why? Because an executive office does not, as a rule, desire to come before the Appropriations Committee and tell why the deficiency arose. They can find a way through much more easily, if they can persuade an auditor to certify a claim and present that to the committee. That battle was fought over for years in the Treasury Department, and in the course of that contest we established this rule, that whenever an executive office exceeded or had reached the limit of the appropriation and found it necessary to incur a liability beyond that limit, it should come to Congress with an estimate of an appropriation to be made.

There are other cases that might be cited, but I will not take more time now, and I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], if I have any time left.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not quite understand yet how the auditor was justified in allowing some of these items—one item of over \$100,000. The gentleman spoke of his right to allow a claim not in excess of \$1,000.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Suppose, as an illustration, there is an annual appropriation of \$12,000 for a specific purpose and \$11,000 has been drawn out and paid. One thousand dollars remains. The claim, say a year or two after the fiscal year for which the appropriation was available, comes along for \$800, and the thousand dollars has been covered back as miscellaneous receipts. The claim for \$800, if created within the year for which the appropriation was available, may be stated, and the certificate should come to Congress for a reappropriation of the \$800 of the \$1,000 in excess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It would seem from what the gentleman from Nebraska says that this is a complicated subject, and if all he has said is correct—and I have no doubt that it is, because he

has had long experience as an auditor—these items ought not to be passed by the Appropriations Committee on the mere certificate of the auditor. It is apparent, as I understand the situation, that the certificate of the auditor is sometimes used, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, to whip the devil around the stump in order that the congressional committees who make the appropriations will not too closely examine into the cause of the deficiency; if they did, they might not allow the appropriation. So it seems that when we have items aggregating over \$150,000 we ought not to pass them merely on the certificate of the auditor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Take the question of the refund of internal-revenue taxes. Suppose a million dollars had been paid in internal-revenue taxes, and suppose the ruling of the commissioner had changed the original finding and that \$500,000 had been collected in excess. If that question were determined in court and the costs and interest had been rendered in the judgment along with the claim for a refund of \$500,000, under the ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury the payment of \$500,000 plus costs and plus interest would come here for appropriation to pay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that quite well; but what the Appropriations Committee should do is to find out whether these large items are one of those cases so that they may know whether the item ought to be audited.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. At that point it would be wise to call in the auditors whose certificates are here and ask them those questions, and thus verify the record.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think so; otherwise it is quite likely that large sums will be devoted to purposes which Congress does not approve.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recapitulation of claims allowed by the Auditor for the Post Office Department.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in page 50, line 13, the words "recapitulation of."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 13, strike out the words "recapitulation of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have passed over a few items. The first is on page 3, lines 8 to 11, and I will ask to return to that item.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Night schools: For teachers and janitors of night schools, including teachers of industrial, commercial, and trade instruction, and teachers and janitors of night schools may also be teachers and janitors of day schools, \$25,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the point of order is withdrawn. Now I ask unanimous consent to return to the first item on page 3, line 1.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two principals of junior high schools, at \$2,500 each.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert "two principals of junior high schools at \$2,500 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GOOD: Page 3, line 2, insert "two principals of junior high schools at \$2,500 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. The next item is on page 11, commencing at line 13. My recollection is that the proviso went out on a point of order and it was unanimously agreed that it could be returned to with the point of order still pending, as if no action had been taken on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that the proviso is not offered.

Mr. GOOD. The first part went out. The whole thing is offered.

Mr. BLANTON. It all went out.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.



Mr. BLANTON. If part of it is subject to a point of order, all of it would be.

Mr. BLACK. The RECORD will show that the gentleman from Texas agreed to reserve his point of order to the whole paragraph. Whether or not he still makes it remains to be seen.

Mr. GOOD. The whole paragraph should be read, with the point of order of the gentleman from Texas reserved.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph was read before I reserved the point of order. I now withdraw the point of order, and it is useless to reread it, unless somebody wants to renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the next item is on page 18.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When they read one of these paragraphs that have been passed do they not have to vote upon it before it goes into the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. But this particular paragraph never went out.

The CHAIRMAN. It had gone out, but was restored at the time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 13 and move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Iowa a question. On page 13, in the enumeration of hospitals, \$500,000 is appropriated for certain hospitals—I think 14. Does that carry the idea that all other hospitals in the country for the care of soldiers are properly equipped and that no repairs will be necessary?

Mr. GOOD. These are the only ones they could enumerate that have been taken over from the War Department on which they expected to expend money.

Mr. MILLER. I notice half of this appropriation goes to three States—Maryland, Montana, and Idaho.

Mr. GOOD. The committee had nothing to do with that. The Public Health Service said they needed these temporary hospitals and needed the equipment, and we gave them all that they asked for these particular hospitals.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum here. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will withhold that for a moment, I have only one item more and then we will rise.

Mr. BLANTON. We have been working here a good long time and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members present, a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask now unanimous consent to return to page 18, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, this, I understand, was passed with unanimous consent to be returned to.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. PARRISH. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] desires to offer an amendment. He does not happen to be on the floor at this time. If it would be agreeable to the chairman, I would like to have this item passed until he can be present.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent was given at the time to return to this item.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have looked into the matter and I do not believe it would be wise to change the wording here. If this were a new matter we might use different words, but these words have been used during all of the years and the appropriation has been carried in that form. The records have been published under these names, and I think I would not care to wait to have the gentleman here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I happen to know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] had some telephonic communication with the Navy Department. I do not know what the facts are. It will not take over 10 minutes to dispose of this proposition when we get to it, and the bill will have to be passed over to-night on account of the navy-yard amendment. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Texas is not in the Chamber at this moment, I hope that the gentleman from Iowa will not insist upon disposing of this matter now.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that this item be passed over for the present.

Mr. PARRISH. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that this item be passed over, to be returned to later. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the statements which have been made as to his attitude in reference to the Speedway Hospital. I refer to the former Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. CARTER GLASS.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this a letter from the gentleman while Secretary of the Treasury or since he became a Member of the other body?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This is, I think, one of the last letters written by him before leaving the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, explaining to the House that while gentlemen criticized him the Hon. JOSEPH W. FORDNEY was in his office and in his presence he offered to sign a contract to pay \$3,000,000 to the contractor in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will it appear in to-day's RECORD?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We will now go to page 40—

Mr. GOOD. I will after we finish the other.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman does not have to get unanimous consent, he has the right to return to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. I will do that to-morrow. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4046, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture I offer a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa offers a report, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves all points of order on the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT, INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the conferees of the Indian appropriation bill may be filed at any time between now and midnight.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to file the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill at any time until midnight. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, when does the gentleman intend to bring it up?

Mr. SNYDER. I intend to bring it up to-morrow if I can get the floor to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech delivered by my colleague, Congressman CROWTHER, before the American Legion at Fort Plain, N. Y., January 8, on the subject of "America first."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### NAVY YARD, NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from John M. Parker, of the city of New Orleans, the next governor of the State of Louisiana, in



connection with the necessity of maintaining the docks and navy yard at New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting a letter with respect to the navy yard at New Orleans. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to do this against my friend from Louisiana, but I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. We will thrash that out to-morrow.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But I can not get time to thrash it out, and that is the reason I ask this.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS TO-MORROW.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with business in order to-morrow under Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business for to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has the call under a special order for to-morrow and the next Calendar Wednesday, and while I do not know what the chairman of the committee intends to call up, whether it is the sedition bill or some of the other measures on the calendar, I do not think after a special order has been made that we should eliminate that day.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee, whom I consulted before I made this request, has no objection to having the Calendar Wednesday dispensed with for to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. I want to say to the gentleman that it is highly important that we should conclude the bill to-morrow that is now before the House, and that we take up the Agricultural bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Here is a question I want to ask. If Calendar Wednesday is dispensed with for to-morrow, the Judiciary Committee has the next call for two days?

Mr. MONDELL. The Judiciary Committee does not lose its right.

Mr. WALSH. I think it would under the special order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not a special order exactly. The Chair thinks it was simply a permission to the Judiciary Committee to introduce the bill that evening without losing the two days, and that committee will have the right for the next two days. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman from Wyoming to say that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee stated that he had nothing urgent to bring up to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say just that. The chairman of the committee said that he had no objection to dispensing with the Calendar Wednesday call for to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Wyoming confer with the chairman of the committee this afternoon about that matter?

Mr. MONDELL. I did.

Mr. GARD. And he has no objection, and it is understood that the committee has the two succeeding Wednesdays following to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### NAVY YARD AT NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to print the letter to which I have already referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman printing the letter from Mr. Parker?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that letter ought to go in here in connection with this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is in connection with the maintenance of navy yards and docks, is it not?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to print in the Record a letter from John M. Parker, a distinguished citizen of New Orleans and the next governor of Louisiana, with reference to the maintenance of the Government navy yard at New Orleans. He is a gentleman who has devoted himself assiduously to the Mississippi River and its problems, the cotton industry in all its ramifications, and the general wel-

fare of the country in every particular, and who is known in our national politics as the friend and companion of the late Theodore Roosevelt when that distinguished American was the candidate of the Progressive Party for the Presidency of the United States. He was subsequently a candidate for the Vice Presidency himself. Following is the letter:

JANUARY 29, 1920.

Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'CONNOR: I to-day wired you as follows:

"Hope you will use every means at your command to assist in taking steps to assure steady work at navy yard. Am writing."

From an intimate personal knowledge as to the value of a splendid inland harbor like New Orleans, the immense amount of shipping which left this port during the period of the war, and the fact that with the opening of the Lakes to the Gulf deep waterways many trunk lines of steamers centering in this port, and water transportation through 29 States, justify me in making the strongest appeal that lies in my power that Congress in its wisdom should maintain and keep up to the highest degree of efficiency the naval station and dry dock of this city.

We have the finest and safest fresh-water port in the world; are in very close touch with the vast oil fields of Louisiana and Texas and coal fields of Alabama; are the second largest port in the United States; with a magnificent fresh-water harbor, free from danger of tropical storms of any character, and feel that based on the past record we have a perfect right to appeal to the patriotic Congress to realize the urgent importance of the maintenance on the Gulf of Mexico of a great harbor and naval station in immediate touch with the huge Government warehouses here, and where the products of the whole Nation can be promptly and quickly concentrated and shipped to the world.

Bespeaking the most vigorous action at your hands in this important matter, I am,

Very truly, yours,

JOHN M. PARKER.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4382. An act to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States; and

H. R. 9112. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 8953. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of schools therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern; and

H. R. 10701. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Whiteville Lumber Co., Goldsboro, N. C., to construct a bridge across the Waccamaw River at or near Old Dock, county of Columbus, N. C.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2690. An act authorizing the appointment of a minister to Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 620. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the Pioneer Educational Society and its successor for certain lands in the diminished Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 730. An act to amend chapter 559 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2962. An act for the relief of Nick Stith and Billie H. Evashanks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 604. An act for the relief of Dellah Siebenaler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3138. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the Great Northern Railway Co. certain lands for stockyards, and for other purposes, etc.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3610. An act for the relief of William S. Britton, formerly second lieutenant of Infantry, who has been dropped from the rolls of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2956. An act to amend sections 4874 and 4875 of the Revised Statutes and to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 20. An act to provide for the payment for certain lands within the former Flathead Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



S. 2786. An act authorizing the sale of lands in Gregory County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 3406. An act for the purchase of buildings and grounds for the embassy of the United States at Brussels, Belgium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 907. An act for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2442. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church by patent in fee certain land within the Yankton Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3682. An act to regulate the filling of vacancies in the Corps of Cadets in the United States Military Academy not otherwise provided for by existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3683. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3750. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for the loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, as amended by the act of July 9, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 400. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, with Senate amendment; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from myself to Secretary of the Navy Daniels and his reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter written to Secretary Daniels and the reply to him by the Secretary. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if it is in connection with his \$9,000,000 proposed appropriation that is coming up to-morrow?

Mr. CARSS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that this letter is an account of a rescue of human life that took place on the Great Lakes.

Mr. BLANTON. And it has no reference to what is coming up to-morrow?

Mr. CARSS. None whatever.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARSS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the correspondence referred to:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1920.

Hon. JOSEPHUS DANIELS,  
Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is popularly supposed that the thrilling deeds of the Navy are only performed on the high seas. In the heart of America, however, there took place one of the most daring rescues that has been recorded in the annals of modern seamanship.

Capt. John Anderson, of Chicago, in command of "sub" chaser 428, bound from Chicago to Grand Marais, Minn., performed a deed of daring that will long be told on the upper Great Lakes. This "sub" chaser, by your orders, had been allotted to the Life-Saving Service for use as a patrol boat at Grand Marais, Minn., but, encountering terrific gales on lower Lake Superior, had been forced to put in at Grand Marais, Mich., for shelter. Scarcely had she reached this place of safety when word came that the freighter *D. N. Runnells* was pounding to pieces on the reefs outside and all hope for the safety of the crew was given up. Despite the fears of old marines that he and his crew would never return, Capt. Anderson, with his crew, acting in conjunction with the local life-saving force, put out to rescue the crew of the *Runnells*. Three times was Capt. Anderson swept out of the lifeboat, but managed to swim back and clamber in, and at the risk of their very lives these brave men succeeded in rescuing the entire personnel of the stranded *Runnells*. Just as the last of the 17 rescued had reached safety the *Runnells* broke in two and sank beneath the turbulent waves. To the bravery and heroism of Capt. Anderson and his crew 17 worthy sailors owe their lives to-day.

But, my dear Secretary, had it not been for your action in allotting this excellent little ship to the station at Grand Marais, Minn., this heroic rescue would not have been possible and 17 lives would have been lost.

On behalf of my constituents in Minnesota who follow their dangerous calling on the upper Great Lakes, I wish to thank you for responding to our request for the allotment of this splendid little ship. It is one protection they have against the treacherous elements.

I beg to remain

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WM. L. CARSS.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,  
Washington, D. C., 29 January, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. CARSS: I am directed by the Secretary of the Navy to acknowledge receipt of your communication, dated 21 January, 1920,

relative to the bravery of Capt. John Anderson, in command of submarine chaser No. 428, and to inform you that the department will take pleasure in submitting it to the Board of Awards for consideration.

Very truly, yours,

THOS. WASHINGTON,  
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,  
Chief of Bureau.

The Hon. W. L. CARSS, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PELL, for the rest of the week, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. DONOVAN, for five days, on account of death in family.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 4, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting request for legislation authorizing the publication of the Daily Shipping Bulletin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report and request for legislation for the relief of the owner of Lock No. 15, Cornwall Canal, Ontario, Canada; to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. NOLAN, from the Committee on Patents, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9932) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry, inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 595), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the expenses of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 596), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IRELAND: A bill (H. R. 12237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hanna City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Toluca, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Varna, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12240) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hennepin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lafayette, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Deer Creek, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hopedale, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mackinaw, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Morton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



Also, a bill (H. R. 12246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tremont, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12247) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Green Valley, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bureau, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Depue, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12250) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lamoille, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dunlap, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12252) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elmwood, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12253) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Glasford, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12254) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spring Valley, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Walnut, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Tiskilwa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sheffield, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12258) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ohio, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12259) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Bedford, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece and shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12260) to amend section 600 of an act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 12261) to amend paragraph 10 of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12262) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Cassville, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12263) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Neosho, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12264) to purchase a site for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Monett, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 12265) to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 12266) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12267) to regulate motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 12268) to create revenue for defraying, carrying out, contributing toward, or meeting the requirements of any legislation to be presently enacted awarding funds to any enlisted or commissioned man in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who now has or who hereafter may receive an honorable discharge therefrom; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12269) to amend the naturalization laws to provide for the Americanization of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 12270) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12271) to amend the act entitled "An act for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 287) to enable the Public Health Service to cooperate with States in the investigation and control of malaria in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 12273) granting a pension to Eliza Raley Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 12274) granting a pension to William H. Hambleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 12275) granting a pension to Mary S. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 12276) for the relief of Frank Emile Parrott; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12277) for the relief of the estate of Leavitt Grimes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12278) for the relief of Lee Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 12279) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Booher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12280) granting an increase of pension to James Hafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12281) for the relief of the William Gordon Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12282) granting a pension to Nancy Halem; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12283) granting a pension to David C. Stephens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 12284) granting an increase of pension to William Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12285) granting a pension to Mary L. Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12286) granting a pension to Elmina Duteher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 12287) granting an increase of pension to W. N. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12288) granting a pension to William Wilburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12289) granting a pension to Mack Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12290) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Shelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12291) granting a pension to Maria Theresa Smyth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 12292) for the relief of Clair J. McFadden; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 12293) granting an increase of pension to Clark Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 12294) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greenlee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12295) for the relief of Frank H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12296) granting compensation to Charles K. Rensberg; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1304. By the SPEAKER: Petition of citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1305. Also, petition of the first national convention of the Labor Party assembled in the city of Chicago, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



1306. Also, petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Franklin County, Idaho, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1307. By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 12143, granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1308. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Michigan Central Railroad System Federation of Railway Shop Employees, opposing the pending railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1309. Also, petition of the United States local inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, of Chicago, Ill., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1310. Also, petition of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States, favoring House bill 10373; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1311. Also, petition of the American Association of State Highway Officials, favoring House bill 9412; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1312. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Roger Casement Branch of Friends of Irish Freedom, of Boston, Mass., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1313. By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of citizens of Cornwall, Goshen, New Hartford, Kent, and New Preston, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the right of suffrage for the American Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1314. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pierce McCan Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that no payment of interest due on foreign loans be deferred and that no financial or commercial assistance be given to any State which is seeking, directly or indirectly, to reduce an alien people to subjection or to hold in subjection a people which is working toward its own liberation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1315. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Napa (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1316. Also, petition of G. H. Hacke, director, Department of Agriculture, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1317. Also, petition of the Bennett Co., of Forks of Salmon, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1318. Also, petition of R. H. Marchant, of Oakland, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1319. Also, petition of the San Francisco (Calif.) Labor Council, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1320. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of the Newport Lodge, No. 273, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1321. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the John Regan Post, No. 2, American Legion, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

1322. Also, petition of the Rotary Club, Boise, Idaho, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1323. Also, petition of citizens of Kalamazoo and Calhoun Counties, Mich., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1324. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Roger Casement Branch of Friends of Irish Freedom, Boston, Mass., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1325. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of the Federation of Farm Bureaus of the State of West Virginia, favoring House bill 10511; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 4, 1920.

Rev. Alfred E. Barrows, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our God and our Father, Thou whose throne is eternal in the heavens, the scepter of whose kingdom is a scepter of righteousness, we beseech the granting and guiding of Thy Holy Spirit in all the councils of this body. We pray that Thou wilt grant wisdom from above, that righteousness and justice and truth shall prevail. We come thanking Thee for guidance in the days that are past and for the blessings that have come upon us as a people and a Nation. We pray that Thou wilt so guide our leaders and strengthen them that in the days to come we shall do Thy will here upon earth more and more, to the glory of Jesus Christ, in whose name we lift up our prayer. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1920, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NAVAL STATION, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII (S. DOC. NO. 210).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy of the 28th ultimo submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the sum of \$128,260.60, required by the Navy Department for the Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ARMY AND NAVY OFFICERS (S. DOC. NO. 194).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th ultimo, further information relative to the name, rank, assignment, headquarters, etc., of commissioned officers assigned to duty in other than strictly combatant or line organizations, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11368) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 11368, the Indian appropriation bill, to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 94 to the bill, in manner and form as if the House had receded from its disagreement thereto and had agreed to the same, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4382. An act to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States; and

H. R. 9112. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia presented resolutions adopted by the Parent-Teachers' Association, of La Habra, Calif., favoring the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of Clarence Lieurance Post, No. 2, American Legion, of Neosho Falls, Kans., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions of Eldred Post, No. 174, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Medicine Lodge; of Graham Post, No. 92, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Seneca; of Beloit Post, No. 147, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Beloit; of Lebanon Post, No. 240, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Lebanon; and of McCaslin Post, No. 117, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Paola, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Roosevelt Post, No. 67, American Legion, of Bridgton, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called Davey sedition bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of McCaslin Post, No. 117, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Paola, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Hays Local Lodge, No. 1223, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Windom, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-Hersman bill providing for collective bargaining, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.